THE BRITISH IN THE SUB-CONTINENT



by

SAYID GHULAM MUSTAFA

FEROZSONS LTD.

THE BRITISH IN THE SUB-CONTINENT

By

SAYID GHULAM MUSTAFA

FOREWORD BY

DR. MAHMUD HUSSAIN

Ferozsons Ltd.

1964

First published in 1961

under the title of

CROSS IN THE SUB-CONTINENT.

Second edition published in
1964

Printed at Ferozsons Ltd, Lahore

TO

HAWA

CONTENTS

"If ever there would rise in India a nationality movement similar to that which we have witnessed in Italy, the English power would not even make the resistance that was made in Italy by Austria but must succumb to it....Do you say "as we conquered them before we would conquer them again"? But I explained that we did not conquer them. I showed you that out of the army which won our victories, four-fifths consisted of native troops. That we were able to hire these native troops for service in India, was due to the fact that the feeling of nationality had no existence there. Now if the feeling of a common nationality began to exist there only feebly; if without inspiring any active desire to drive out the foreigner, it only created a notion that it was shameful to assist him in maintaining his dominion—from that day almost, our Empire would cease to exist. It is a condition of our Indian Empire that it should be held without any great effort.... We are not prepared to bury millions and millions, or army upon army in defending our acquisition. The moment that began to show herself, what we so idly imagine her to be, a conquered nation, that moment we should recognise perforce the impossibility of retaining her".

Sir John Seeley.

FOREWORD

It has been a real pleasure to go through this book of Mr. Sayid Ghulam Mustafa. The Author has been well-known in educational circles as Principal of one of the biggest colleges in Pakistan—the Sind Muslim College, Karachi. He entered the field of education with a rich background as an alumnus of the Muslim University, Aligarh, and the University of Durham. For many years he served the Sind Muslim College with great distinction and unparalleled devotion. Indeed there came a stage when it was difficult to imagine the College without him, a case of *man tu shudam, tu man shudi* (من تو شدم تو من شدی). It was only recently that he was called upon to take up the post in the Directorate of Public Instruction, West Pakistan.

Now Mr. Sayid Ghulam Mustafa has produced a book of history which is rather different from the ordinary works on the subject. Even if it were a conventional type of work, it would have its value. There are not many Muslim writers on what is termed the British period of the history of Hind-Pakistan. Most of the books on this period have been written by British historians and they usually paint a very black picture of

things as they were before the British came and eulogize Britain's work in giving to the subcontinent peace, order and prosperity. Hindu and Muslim writers have either taken the clue from the British historians—this is particularly true of the theses submitted by them at the various universities in U.K.—or they have indulged in anti-British propaganda.

Mr. Sayid Ghulam Mustafa strikes a balance between these two extremes. He gives credit to the British when credit is due and he criticizes them where they deserve criticism. The style of the author is refreshing and vigorous. Above all, it is his own. While reading the book one seems to be meeting the author himself. His straightforwardness, his sincerity, his habit of calling a spade a spade, his dislike for conventionality are all written on every page of this work. In this sense, this book is intensely personal.

I congratulate Mr. Sayid Ghulam Mustafa on an excellent piece of writing in the field of History.

University of Karachi: *Mahmud Hussain*

PREFACE

It is more than a decade that the subcontinent of India was partitioned and Pakistan and India became two independent countries. As that event of the partition of the subcontinent recedes, it is becoming more and more imperative for the proper understanding of our historical background to evaluate the rule that we have shaken off. Pakistan and India, till now, have depended mostly on British statesmen, politicians, historians, educationists and travellers for any writing on the nature of the British rule in the country.

If we have a look at the books written during the British period we find that their titles are so deceptive—hardly a few titles tell the real truth about the material embodied in them. It is significant that all the writings by the Englishmen, before the First Great War, were more bold, patronising, self-adoring, and to put it in the language of the time 'imperialistic'—even some of the most authoritative writtings gave the impression of fiction. The writings by Muslims and Hindus during this period showed the signs of their diffidence, sadness and their being hypnotized by Western education, culture and civilization. Soon after the War and increasingly

so after 1929 (the year of the Simon Commission and the Great Depression) the writings of the Englishmen became less patronising, more like healing the sores and winning the people of the country, and telling the truth about the subcontinent to the British public. It was said that an Englishman frankly discussing himself, was a remarkable post-war phenomenon. The writings of the people of the subcontinent during this period showed increasing tendencies to bitterness. It was because, in the words of Professor Rushbrook Williams, "prior to 1914, India like the rest of Asia had begun to feel restless beneath the impact of Western civilization. This civilization, for many years regarded as a phenomenon extraordinary and indeed super-human in its omnipotence, had forfeited the glamour of novelty and was now seen to possess the defects of its quality. More important still its mastery over material force had lost the inexplicable character which at one time, distinguished it in the eyes of the people of the East."

The decision of August, 1947, in fact, enhanced the significance of a writing like this. The subject of this book has a strong bearing on the past, on the present and the future of our country. Pakistan's problems and difficulties can never be easy to solve without a profound comprehension of this essential background. I have so pursued the discussion that it can equally be applied in

its historicity both to India and Pakistan. All the plans and schemes conceived without any regard of this background would have simply a theoretical value but would not be helpful in the execution of actual schemes. As a matter of fact, the entire programmes of the Governments of the two countries cannot be adequately discussed without bearing these events and factors in mind. Anything undertaken by way of reform in which we do not consider this historical background, as a fact, would prove a disastrous failure. We must own that the present must draw from the past to make the future hopeful and that knowledge and wisdom means the accumulated experience of generations past.

Now it is time that we, the nationals of Pakistan and India, do something to evaluate the consequence of that rule. The period of British writings on the issues of this subcontinent is over. Now it is a challenge that we have to face. I am of the opinion that we should, more and more, dedicate ourselves to the study of the background of our independence. It is the duty of our historians to apply their minds to this. I am afraid, I cannot resist alluding to the unhealthy tendency among our teachers and men of letters to feel shy of writing on the history of the subcontinent. It is a disconcerting phenomenon to observe that students and scholars of European, British or Indo-Pakistan history

try their best to pass, as a matter of fashion, as students of Islamic History, for which their mastery is so shallow. I am convinced of the usefulness of this kind of writing and my endeavour has been to bring out two companion volumes, this one and the other "*Legacy of Britain.*" I am fully conscious of the immensity, difficulty and the delicacy of the task. In a discussion of this nature there are bound to be some facts not exactly pleasing but truth is truth and the longer it is withheld the greater the harm we shall do to ourselves historically.

While reading Trevelyan's "English Social History," I felt like repeating many words of caution written by that great historian in the introduction to his work. We must bear in mind that the forces moulding the life of the subcontinent during the period of our discussion, have been mostly external and less indigenous. There lies the rub. England was generally said to have had a "material interest in India." So I have felt the necessity to explain certain features which may appear as incongruities but which will certainly be very clear to any one acquainted with the peculiar conditions that prevailed in the "tempest-tost land." I should like to say, in passing, that the allied nature of subjects like History, Politics, Economics, Sociology, Psychology and Education is universally recognised and specially so in a discussion of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent, we shall not be

excused if we omit, underrate or obtusely emphasise the historical, political, racial, economic and military issues. In the subcontinent during the British rule (British rule as an institution of external control) these issues have had a greater bearing on Social, Educational and Psychological development of the people than is commonly known and to deny this phenomenon will be tantamount to committing literary suicide.

I must emphasise that though this book, for practical and historical reasons, has been divided into chapters, it has essentially been conceived of as one single whole. I have endeavoured to make the material as compact as possible. I have followed this course for reasons of lucidity and logicality which no writer can ignore in the presentation of his information. This scheme of work has also proved helpful to maintain continuity in institutional discussion which, I was afraid, might be marred by too much stress on historicity. I gave a sigh of relief when I found that my efforts in this direction were able to achieve an encouraging and appreciable success.

Another point which I should like to emphasise is that I have maintained the very necessary distinction between the Muslims as such (*i.e.*, the believers of a religion), the Muslims as they were during the Muslim rule (*i.e.* race governed in many cases by the

principles of expediency) and the Muslims as they came to be during the British rule—*i.e.*, a subject people refusing to believe and to acknowledge the fact that they were subjects. Muslim society and Muslim institutions maintained certain characteristics and acquired others at various stages and under different circumstances. The same is true of the Hindus as the believers of a religion, the Hindus as a subject people during the Muslim rule and Hindus as a subject people during the British rule. This was an allusion which I could not resist making for the sake of a proper understanding of the subsequent discussion.

It will be found that I have relied on those sources of information and those authorities which have been objective in their character *i. e.* candid and sympathetic to other people's viewpoint and frankly critical about their own. I have avoided relying on the authorities which could be said to have been biased or prejudiced by some extraneous circumstances. Reliance has been placed upon those writers who had the courage to speak the truth or have not been extravagantly extolling or pulling down anything. I have scrupulously avoided making references to tendentious writings of Muslims, Hindus and Englishmen which have unfortunately played a very pernicious part in spreading venom and by contributing to many lamentable features of the Indo-British relationship. There are many

writers (especially journalists and free lance writers who have been out to create an effect nnd enhance the sale value of their writings) in whose writings we find much information combined with the grossest perversion of facts and much literary talent combined with most annoying presentation. In the sub-continent, especially, there was a tendency not only to mis-represent facts but to indulge in the over-simplification of issues and to gloat in attributing blame. Certain tunes had been played with such persistency and attraction that indigenous ears took anything else to be jarring. It is time that this attitude of mind is discarded. There is every possibility that in keeping an eye on the future no regard is shown to the past. I have tried to encompass in this volume the information which is, I am afraid, in greater danger of being forgotten and lost because it is pathetically scattered. If I have saved some material from total oblivion and have stimulated interest for its recognition and use by posterity, I shall feel amply compensated for my efforts.

I can recollect an occasion of great significance and lesson in my life. In the begining of 1943 Mr. Jinnah, while addressing the students of Aligarh, explaining and justifying his plan in dissociating himself from the Congress Movement of August, 1942, and refuting the charges levelled against him that he was playing in the hands of the British and breaking the Indian unity, had just finished

saying: "Gentlemen, I want freedom as much as any Congressman"; when out came an angry voice, resounding and reverberating in the fully-packed Convocation Hall, "Why not now—Why wait"? Mr. Jinnah paused, looked up—grave and pensive—a hush as if by magic had set over the entire audience and he proceeded in his characteristic, calm, solemn and scathing tone, "Yes now—Yes to-day—Yes here—in Aligarh—Yes in the Strachey Hall—on this platform, here; but Gentlemen, only a little sense of proportion is required". It is this sense of proportion which has been lacking in our outbursts and writings. If I have been able to advance the process of balanced thought my efforts will not be in vain.

Hoping to produce a work of real merit, solid interest and value, I found it advisable to present it in the way I have done; neither too heavy nor too light, acceptable and useful to a student, handy to a scholar, a pointer to a politician and serviceable to a social reformer, a helpful compendium for an educationist and above all an informative and digestible work for an average reader.

Sayid Ghulam Mustafa

. 1 .

PRELUDE

INDIA was a big country, sometimes called a subcontinent. It had its history going back to prehistoric times. It had been formed out of the interaction of various civilizations, cultures and religions. In the long passage of time, the country had passed through many vicissitudes. Scythians, Tartars, Arabs, Afghans, Persians and Turks had invaded the country and continually changed the whole racial composition of its population. Its population consisted of all racial elements—Aryan, Semitic, Mongoloid, semi-Negroid, Dravidian and so on. It was a country in which were found all kinds of stages of human existence. It was a great, interesting land of many anachronisms and had been described by Lord Ronaldshay as "an ethnological pageant epitomizing the gradual growth of civilization through centuries of time."[1] It was commonly recognised that there were three Indias; "The India of great cities standing out in contrast with the India of the hill and forest peoples and between these two the India of the villages serving as a link between life

1. " India—a Bird's Eye View"

in its complex and life in its primitive forms". It was a land of a dozen main languages and more than two hundred dialects. Many languages had lost their form and importance and stood transformed beyond recognition. No one could speak Sanskrit, the language of Hindu civilization and religion, and many languages which were corrupt forms of great tongues had no literature of any kind. Great empires had risen and fallen in the country, a great religion like Buddhism had almost disappeared from the land of its origin. Islam with its revolutionary tendencies, and quite the opposite of all existing faiths in the country, gave rise to tremendous forces; and the country experienced another impact through its contact with England and the West. Very soon it looked like a medley of all things.

It was a land of extremes. "There is great wealth and abject poverty; there is the highest intelligence and abysmal ignorance; there is physical excellence alongside stunted malnutrition and above all there is beauty and ugliness".[1] There existed differences in the country which were more distinct than those existing between any two foreign countries. In habits, customs, traditions and languages, the southern parts differed so much from the northern and the eastern so much from the western that a person from one will look a

1. C. B. Birdwood "A Continent Experiments."

bewildered foreigner in the other. Three fourths of its population lived on agriculture. The appalling poverty of the masses was made worse by the colossal increase in population. Nearly two-thirds of the people lived in one-fourth of the country; the density of its population varied from 4,000 per square mile to 6.5 per square mile; and above all "where there is land there is no water, and where there is water there is no land".

For obvious reasons no generalizations and sweeping statements could faithfully apply to the whole country and its population. The country was too big and the society too loosely knit for the emergence of a single nation state. It had been too big a country for all its invaders. As soon as they consolidated themselves after military conquests, they always settled down to merge themselves and get assimilated in the general population. This merging of every new people in the old necessarily produced the inevitable result of society influx. Partly because the new-comers were affected by the existing traditions and customs of the soil and partly because the existing order took a shape with the influx of the customs and traditions of the new-comers, no invading community could maintain its characteristic identity for long—at least for all ostensible and practical purposes. Soon there sprouted up many separatist tendencies resulting from new resurgence and from the "spirit for the glorification of

the past". Many troubles appeared due to dangers suspected by different communities of their possible extinction in the land.

There are reasons for the British not having merged in the country's peoples. The first important reason was that the British, unlike many other races before, considered the subcontinent a *colonie d'exploitation* and not a *colonie de peuplement.* The other important reason was that by the time an intimate contact between the two countries was established there had grown to sufficent maturity the idea of European society and institutions. All the European peoples were conscious that they were Europeans, and that they shared certain common standards of belief and behaviour. It had been fully recognised by them all that on the strength of that consciousness alone the future of Europe depended. There was throughout these countries a certain general uniformity of life, of ideas, of laws and institutions as of one great family. Even when different European countries were at one another's throats, they never became oblivious of their essential unity. England was a member of that big community and in this ascendant European civilization she could take part with pride. Numerically the Christian world—or to be exact European community of nations— was too big and too proud and too much in command of superior physical power to think of getting absorbed in the subcontinent; the

result was that they were least influenced by indigenous institutions and customs except in a very remote way. Europe in general and England in particular had made great advances in literary, philosopical and scientific pursuits, whereas the subcontinent and the East were in a progressive process of decay; the result was that England had every reason not to convert the country into a dominion like Australia and Canada, not to deal with it as a mere colony and a possession—the country was given the appellation of a Dependency.

Some of the most salutary lessons that the country learnt under British influence were those connected with the art of administration and government. The people of the subcontinent for the first time witnessed the peaceful continuity and sound stability in administration which were so conspicuously missing before. For the first time they saw that there were no filial wars, no civil wars, no wars of succession, no dynastic wars. For the first time they found that however strong and powerful a Viceroy he still obeyed the superior orders from far away Britain and could never imagine declaring himself an independent ruler, setting up an independent dynasty; for the first time they found that the governors of the provinces scrupulously respected central authority without a grumble and would not dream of creating independent states in their provinces; for the first time

they found that though broad policies were formulated at the centre yet complete control of local affairs and working out of details was left to people on the spot; for the first time they found that the British were not suspicious of each other and that the British armies were commanded by one general instead of two as used to be the case before. Learning these lessons the country advanced on a path which we shall attempt to describe in the following pages.

For a full and proper understanding of the issues involved in the relations between England and the subcontinent the following salient and fundamental principles must be borne in mind. The relation between the two countries had been essentially unnatural and political. Until the British acquired territorial supremacy they had little or no influence on the course of the country's life. They had come to the subcontinent as traders; consequently from all sound business principles they had to adopt a policy of mutual confidence and goodwill. Even when they acquired political supremacy, caution remained the principle of their government, and the people being essentially religious, in all their measures the British seldom openly declared or advertised the fact that their rule was based on Christian ideals. When they settled down they tried to maintain the entire administrative machinery as it existed during the time of the Mughals. The two conspicuous instances

of this procedure were the introduction of bureaucratic machinery of government and the land-system. True to the theory and practice of the Muslim rulers, whom they succeeded in the imperial order, they inherited and so used the principles that proprietary right in the soil was essentially vested in the sovereign, and then proceeded to introduce their own ideas of private property. When they in troduced changes in the administrative machinery, in the social, economic and industrial institutions or made certain laws, they scrupulously observed the principle, which Lord Falkland described as "when it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change". The result of this policy was that throughout the British period the country was subjected to influences which were neither synchronous nor uniform either in the country as a whole or in the different sections of its population. Caution, necessity and expediency always remained the basic principles with regard to political and constitutional life. Another important fact was that during this period the country began to progress, either due to direct or indirect support of the British or due to their mere presence and sometimes resistance, with a speed which surprised everyone in the world. The British connection had ushered ın a new era of development, of intellectual life, of reorientation of religious and social ideas and of changes in the economic system. It is bearing these facts in mind that Indo-British

relations, past, present and future can be explained, understood and prognosticated.

The bare facts of the political history of the subcontinent can be briefly stated thus. From the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth, British power was constantly growing. The period before the middle of the eighteenth century was more or less of pure commercial relationship. The first half of the nineteenth century saw a great experimental activity in devising the administrative machinery and in the creation of "Indian India". In 1857 occurred the Mutiny and immediately after that the Mughal imperial line was cut off for ever and the Government of the East India Company was transferred to the Crown. The next fifty years or more are comparatively uneventful, but during the last quarter of the century there sprang up the national movements with a certain seriousness, and the British Government in response to these movements began to fashion the basis of parliamentary government. This problem of representative institutions was essentially connected with the development of English education, with the power and liberty of the Press, with the employment of indigenous people initially in higher civil administrative posts, and later in the higher commissioned appointments in the army, and with the social and political ideas of the parties in England and of the people in the country.

Thus during the British period, the sub-continent became a large field for political experimentation unknown in any country in the world before. It was in the slow and gradual development of the constitutional machinery, that the portents of future differences could be found. The different religious communities began to look upon government by the majority in legislation with suspicion and even alarm; and this phenomenon necessitated modifications, reservations and safeguards, thus making the entire constitutional machinery very complex and bewildering. Parliamentary institutions modified by communal and administrative considerations hardly retained any democratic spirit. When these institutions began to work it was found that the breaking of heads became of greater importance than counting them in the working of constitutional machinery. Two essential factors for the smooth and successful running of parliamentary representative institutions—a sufficiently educated electorate and a sufficiently homogeneous society—were missing. For generations and centuries past the traditions of democracy had never existed in the country. The minority problem, the constant thorn in the flesh of democracy, began to loom large and created convulsions in social life. Simultaneously provincial patriotism took shape when Dyarchy was introduced in 1919. Any new reforms introduced produced unforeseen evils. Governed and modified by

administrative, economic and political policies they always fell short of the required standards. The final result was that whenever new reforms were introduced with these narrow views based upon communal and psychological differences they saved the country from one set of evils but unconsciously led it to evils of another kind. The best way to appreciate these novel phenomena is to mark that in the context of the subcontinent many more things were done by word of mouth than by definite writing, things were generally left rather vague than clear, much more importance was attached to implicit relations than to explicit understandings, and that most matters were generally left to adjust themselves without being judiciously and conscientiously put right. In the subcontinent words like 'official' and 'non-official', 'public' and 'private', 'popular' and 'administrative', 'nominated' and 'elected', 'national' and 'governmental' have not had their strict dictionary meaning nor had they been supposed to carry modern English connotation. In the new context their meanings varied not only as single words but in their combinations too; so much so that even an Englishman would feel in need of explanation to understand them properly. In any discussion about the subcontinent, to ignore the machinery of administration will be a blunder of the first magnitude.

The relations between the subcontinent and England have been characteristic and unprecedented in world history. The vast country had remained—with consequences so acutely being experienced today—the home of peoples speaking diverse languages, and conscious of their distinctions and separateness from one another. There never had been and there never could be a natural unity among the different elements of its population. There had never been a unity of race, language, and uniformity in customs, traditions and institutions. Empires rose, flourished—at times with momentary but exceptional splendour and glory—then crashed and were dissolved. Sometimes these dissolutions took place without causing great turmoil in the country ; and travellers not infrequently commented upon the contrast between political confusion and chaos at the top and comparative prosperity among the mass of the people. All the permutations and combinations and the chess-board moves went on at the top but the base of the society remained unshaken. It was for the first time under modern conditions that problems which localised themselves at the top were taken to the people and they too began to react to the fluctuations in life. English influences enormously jolted not only the social and economic life of the people but with the introduction of Western thought, set on foot a process of vast political developments in the country. England typified the West and the subcontinent typified the East ;

thus the East through England began to assimilate Western ideas and methods and employed them to its best advantage.

To what extent the country had been of advantage to England we shall turn to wherever relevant ; but it must never be forgotten that England had much at stake in the country. It was the safest strategic base for protecting its commercial life-lines ; it was the safest country for its overseas investments ; it made sacrifices for Britain beyond all proportion to the active part that its peoples played in its own life or the world affairs ; and the British statesmen connected with the country's administration either were or became the most successful publicmen of Britain.

While discussing the problems of England and the sub-continent it will be proper to speak about influences on the latter due to events occurring beyond its borders but fundamentally characterized by its relations with England. Britain had become supreme not only in the country but in the East as a whole and there were many factors which contributed to this success—and the major one was the country itself. Britain became the white or European power for the nations of the East. British supremacy took the country's issues and problems beyond its geographical boundaries in a characteristic fashion. Britain had very delicate problems to tackle as a result of this relationship.

British political control added to the geographical barriers of the country and the subcontinent was hermetically sealed from contact with the outside world. The country was completely separated even from its bordering states, and all intimate contacts cultural, social or political, with them depended upon the will of the British administration. Thus all the countries in the East looked upon the subcontinent as a country very dangerous to deal with and there were created many misgivings—rather justifiably—about the indigenous peoples. For many reasons the peoples of the Eastern countries became cautious while dealing with the peoples of the sub-continent. They showed sympathy with their aspirations but put little trust in their active help or support. The subcontinent became isolated from the Eastern countries and it had no place among the countries of the West. The subcontinent was the basis of the British Empire but it had no importance in the affairs of that Empire. The people of the country were directly or indirectly influenced by the direct or indirect support or even mere acquiescence of England in the anti-Indian activities of the dominions. As a matter of fact the acute consciousness of humiliation was generated and constitutional and political relations were strained between the two countries as a result of the attitude of the British dominions with regard to the subcontinent and its peoples. For the first time the people of the country realised that to the

word "India" was attached some obloquy and derision which wounded their self-respect and pride.

The important fact was that whatever was introduced in the subcontinent was superimposed and whatever resulted from it was distorted and injurious. Whatever the democratic nature of the institutions introduced they were so mutilated that they produced most undemocratic results. All activity in the field of administration was at the top, the masses never consciously reacted to it. The natural result was that there were all around more oligarchical institutions than democratic. Even social development began to be more and more thoroughly regulated under oligarchical direction and leadership. For all practical purposes parties verging on totalitarianism were created through parliamentary institutions. Even the education system and education militated against democratic results.

A discussion of the hypothetical position in which the subcontinent would have been if the British had not come in, is redundant and will not serve any purpose. Any discussion of the supposed advance the country would have made without British influence is sham pedantry. Alternatives to British rule are not one or two but many. The entire scope of our discussion I shall confine to "what has been"—a historical fact, and

I shall not deviate to "what might have been"—a very uncertain proposition; and only occasionally shall I discuss "what should have been" in the best interest of the two countries if it "had been differently done". A discussion such as is attempted here, which extends over the entire period of Indo-British relations which themselves have varied constantly, can only deal with broad statements, basic principles and major variations. Any detailed description of any particular aspect would require an independent research and the object of this book is to avoid all extravagant and tendentious hair-splitting which has become a fashion in indigenous writing. There were certain inherent drawbacks in the relations of the two countries, and it is no use being harsh to either side or underestimating the good that has resulted out of the Indo-British connection. A theme can be melancholy or hopeful depending upon the purpose the writer has in view. The future of both the countries demands that a great good could be done by appreciating the other man's point of view. This effort is inspired by a certain hope because I believe that Pakistan has reached maturity under British influences; and as we believe, if we had to learn, we must suffer to learn, because learning in suffering is always beneficial and permanent. I shall quote honest and sincere opinions of Englishmen and Muslims and Hindus who have had no other purpose in their expression but to tell the truth. If we had become conscious of

certain deficiencies, it was Englishmen who created that consciousness among us. It was these Englishmen who essentially contributed to the country's awakening by analysis, by precept, and by example.

A relevant fact to be borne in mind is that modern scientific achievements, modern social, political and educational ideals and the international co-operative spirit synchronised with the progress of British supremacy in the subcontinent. A time had come when a war, a revolution or any other significant change in any part of the world created all round abnormal conditions in the other parts of it. Tremendous changes were taking place and were to take place in England beginning with the end of the eighteenth century; and though initially the country was not directly affected by those, yet it was given a volcanic jolt by the events of the time. It was impossible that the people of the subcontinent would go uninfluenced by the American Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the American Civil War, the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, the Great War I, the Russian Revolution, the Great Depression of 1929 and by the events of Great War II. Every event was affecting the indigenous peoples and consequently their relation with England. It was impossible that subterranean effervescence created by so many world events, which the people of the country were so closely watching and studying, would subside without

an eruption. It is a recognised phenomenon in history that people weep, then complain, then groan and finally they are impelled into rebellion; or initially they fear, then get aggrieved, their grief is intensified into anger and anger results in activities of sedition and treason. Once convinced that there was no other way of getting rid of the foreign yoke than by revolution, they felt encouraged by the words of Burke that "Revolution is the best resort of the thinking and the good".

To the people of the subcontinent, after they had imbibed the new liberal and democratic teachings, it looked paradoxical and unconvincing that a progressive and democratic country like Britain still maintained autocratic and bureaucratic institutions in their country. It was impossible that this unrealistic and unnatural way of action would escape unchallenged for long. What the country could groan under and silently acquiesce in mediaeval times, it could not permit to prevail now that the British themselves had made it conscious of the conditions of life. The people felt surprised that a democratic, and liberty-loving country like England many a time played a part which was a negation of the above ideals. The people were dissatisfied or discontented not with this or that aspect of the administration but they essentially questioned the very basis of authority and the nature of British control. Through all kinds of reasoning they came to realise and

rightly there could be no other conclusion, that the basis of British administration was no popular will but a superior military force. They found that by chance they were bound to the most advanced western country and the truth and the consciousness of British ideals in the abstract and the administrative practices in the country could never be withheld from them for long by any artificial means or subtle policies. Once England had announced its authority as a trust and assumed responsibility to teach, it could not withdraw. English education revolutionized indigenous thought, till it ushered in revolution itself.

Perhaps no one had been more convinced and conscious of the inevitable end of British authority in the country some day than the British themselves. The saner elements knew that the British Empire was as much governed by inexorable laws of the rise, growth, decline and fall of empires as any other empire before in world history. If there was any section of the British community which remained blind to this universal truth it was the British bureaucracy. It was the bureaucracy which was responsible for the unhappy episodes in Indo-British relations. They refused to face facts and courageously confront the truth. The members of the bureaucracy were repeatedly warned that they could prove to be the biggest enemies of Britain. It was they who could by subtle administrative measures completely destroy the real purpose of liberal

parliamentary legislation for the country. British statesmen and philosophers openly declared the dangers which might arise from their way of thinking and behaving. On the other hand, there were wiser British statesmen in scores, who strove to maintain happy relations between the two countries even when they separated. To them the future of the sub-continent was of as much concern and interest as the future of their own country.

Every problem in the subcontinent had been unique in its complexity. Any conditions prevailing in any country of the world presented no analogies and no solutions. In the discussion of any subject no preconceived notions arrived at in any other country and through the study of any other system would be of any avail. That was why a Viceroy declared "At first sight, that may seem a very plain and simple polity, and very easy to be applied, but when you come to apply it to an empire multitudinous in its traditions, as well as in its inhabitants, almost infinite in variety of races which populate it and of creeds which have shaped their character you find that it involves administrative problems unsolved by Caesar, unsolved by Charlemange and unsolved by Akbar".[1] That was why repeatedly wherever any problem of the sub-continent was discussed or explained, warn-

1. Lord Lytton's speech at the State Banquet 1877.

ings were given that no lessons learnt and experiences gained under different circumstances and in different countries would help the discussion at all and no solutions could be arrived at. To understand the problem of the country it was necessary to approach it with an open mind. The very failure of all preconceived schemes and ideas concerning education, society, administration and so on, and their application to national life had proved beyond any doubt the necessity of such an approach. There is no writer on any subject of this kind who does not give a warning of this nature to avoid injustice to himself, and to bring arguments home to his readers.

. 2 .

THE DOLDRUMS

The condition of the subcontinent in the eighteenth century was perhaps the unhappiest in the history of that unfortunate country. The one empire which had given it even a semblance of unity was fast crumbling away. The very partial success of the Mughals in creating any unity proved the futility of the attempt. The Mughals maintained a bureaucratic organization of a high standard of efficiency. It was on the system of Mughal bureaucracy that the British bureaucracy of the nineteenth century was conceived. Time proved that the British became not only the territorial but also the ideological successors of the Mughals in many ways.

The Muslim period of Indian History—beginning with the end of the tenth century—was a period of great cultural renaissance. Islamic principles of life and conduct influenced the entire structure of the country's life and society. Sanskrit, due to its unhistorical nature, began to fall out after the

Muslim conquests and in the hands of Pandits it became over-sophisticated and hide-bound. Persian became the official language, and Muslim art displayed the simplicity of Islam. The volcanic eruption of new ideas and conceptions brought in by this new faith broke the monotony, lethargy and stagnation of Hindu life. The Muslims followed the historic north-western route and they fully demonstrated their territorial and cultural supremacy. In the thirteenth century a Muslim empire spread across all the northern parts of the subcontinent and in the first half of the sixteenth century was established the Mughal Empire—the glory of Muslim rule in the subcontinent. With the dismemberment and collapse of that empire in 1707, though the political ascendency of the Muslims disappeared yet their place on the soil was fixed for all time to come.

On the fall of the Mughal colossus, all round multiple, large and small, principalities began to shape. All such ostensible unity as the country possessed was disappearing, and everywhere local strong men, heads of tribes and communities, ambitious upstarts and soldiers of fortune were scrambling for territory and power. The confusion was general and in every way, might was right. Anybody, who could raise an army, could easily establish a separate principality; and under such unsettled circumstances the mis-

rule of many adventurers went to fantastic limits in cruelties and excruciations. This incredible internal anarchy was made worse by external activities and invasions. The invasion of Nadir Shah in 1739 accompanied by the massacre in Delhi, was followed by the incessant Afghan attacks from 1749 to 1762. The Marhattas were active in the South in their traditional way. They stripped the fields of their produce and the granaries of their contents; they set fire to villages and plundered and pillaged every house. Though they were Hindus and were inspired by a certain religious zeal, yet in their activities they showed few religious scruples. The predatory Marhattas were joined by other freebooters like the Pindaris and the Thugs. Simultaneously there smouldered the rivalry of powers indigenous and European, in the gigantic and ceaseless struggle for supremacy. "It was an era of chaos unprecedented even in the annals of Asiatic History; an era such as only follows the break-up of wide-spreading empire which has so carefully knocked out and cut away all internal and local stays and ties that its fall, when it comes, is a ruinous crash and leaves a vast territory in a state of political dissolution."[1] All cancerous features of the country's life, *e.g.*, the centrifugal forces in the administration, the lack of rules of procedure in succession which generally gave rise either to mur-

1. Alfred Lyall "Asiatic Studies".

ders, assassinations and intrigues in the family or to an open war, were present. All these activities and factors contributed to making the country a boiling inferno. On the death of Aurangzeb in 1707, it was clear that the subcontinent was a fit field for a new adventurer. The death of Aurangzeb's successor (Bahadur Shah) in 1712 made the disintegration visible. The history of the next fifty years is one of the most piteous in all history and this can be estimated from the fact that even in Delhi, the capital of the great empire, anarchy was unchecked and widespread.

With the fall of the Mughal empire all finer aspects of life had gone under. Art and literature were in an increasing state of decay. The scoundrels were interested in disturbing the peace of the country, whereas the sages had forgotten all practical aspects of life and had become more brooding than effective and active. The country as a whole was stepping into a state of wilderness and confusion. The condition of the subcontinent in the eighteenth century can aptly be described as that of misery and desolation. With the disappearance of the Mughal empire, hell was let loose. There was hardly anyone to be found during a century or more who could be remembered for things of real worth and merit. Greedy nobles and opportunist officials preyed like parasites on the state and on the population of the country. It was during this period that what is known as

"the Underworld of India" began to grow and acquire alarming proportion in society. Life in the subcontinent till after the Mutiny of 1857 could well be described in the words of Hobbes as "cruel, nasty, brutish and short". Everyone was against every one else. The country was perfectly ready to receive an intruder: this time the portents foreboded that the intruder would come in, not from the North, but from the South.

Even in the beginning of the nineteenth century when the Company's authority was unquestioned and the Mughal emperors were no more than figure-heads, the awe inspired by Mughal authority still continued. Arthur Wellesley (later Duke of Wellington) testified that "notwithstanding His Majesty's total deprivation of real power almost every state and every class of people continue to acknowledge his nominal sovereignty", and to this even the powerful East India Company was no exception. "The King of Delhi was an empty pageant" in the opinion of Warren Hastings; and Bentinck believed in letting the Mughal king "sink in insignificance instead of upholding our dignity as we have done".[1] Sir John Malcolm in his characteristic language put it "His Majesty of Oudh makes me sick. If the King of Delhi was in fact an absurdity or a mockery (I do not admit it was either) it had its roots in a wise conformance

---

1. Thompson "The making of the Indian Princes"

to usage in a generous consideration of the feelings of fallen greatness. It was the veneration of a great power that had passed away; and the superstition that continued to give homage to the shrine, which we had addressed to propitiate our rise, was sanctioned by the example of the wisest among nations..the expenditure was duly repaid in the return of impression".[1] The sad history of the decline had commenced long ago. In 1765 Clive secured Diwani of Bihar, Bengal and Orissa from Shah Alam, the Mughal Emperor, now virtually a prisoner of the Company. Shah Alam left Allahabad for Delhi only to be a tool in the hands of the Marhattas. In 1788 he was blinded by certain ruffians and in 1804 General Lake took the unfortunate blind emperor under his protection. In 1827 Lord Amherst insisted upon meeting a successor of Shah Alam as equal. In 1857 the sepoys from Meerut rushed to Delhi proclaiming Bahadur Shah II, still regarded by millions as their rightful ruler, as their leader. After the Mutiny he was tried and deposed and ended his unhappy days in captivity at Rangoon as a State prisoner. Such was the end and such were the fluctuations in the fortunes of the greatest and most powerful of all ruling dynasties which had ever occupied the throne of Delhi.

---

1. Thompson and Garratt "The Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India."

It will be helpful to discuss the character of the Mughal rule in order to estimate to what extent the successors of the Mughals—The British—followed in their footsteps. The Mughal empire was a military despotism. Much depended upon the personal character and ability of the monarch. He was supposed to be personally administering the country. The entire administrative machinery was highly centralized. The country was divided into a number of provinces (subas) over which governors (subedars) were appointed. The general tendency among the powerful men in the administration was that every governor appointed took the earliest opportunity to run at a tangent and declare himself independent. In those days difficulties in communication were many. The result was that the governors exercised large and extravagant power and their moral degeneration was general. Though a very comprehensive system of espionage was maintained, yet the imperial orders were many a time issued on the basis of rumours and false information. The treasury was the personal property of the sovereign and any work undertaken to advance social happiness and public good, was supposed to be a charitable gesture on the part of the monarch and proved his large-heartedness and philanthropic nature.

Turning to the daily activities of the monarch we find that Darbar and Darshan

were characteristic features of the Mughal Court. They had long forgotten the simple ways of Muslim life and had surrounded themselves with wealth, luxuries, pomp and show. Their strength and virility were sapped and they got demoralised in many ways. But in spite of the fact that these institutions carried certain sinister and ominous shortcomings in the long run, still they served the immediate purpose by establishing the tradition which made it incumbent upon those in authority to be personally accessible to the humblest of subjects. The entire society consisted of a small aristocracy and of a very large poor class—for all practical purposes there was no middle class. (The rise of an intellectual and urban middle class was a characteristic development of the British rule). The population of the country was scattered in innumerable small villages and the fundamental basis of government machinery and social life was agricultural economy. Since all covetable aspects of life were with the government, the energetic and the talented sought their advancement in the state service. The entire nobility of the Mughals was based on service to the rule (which was also true of the character of the nobility under British rule); but the order of nobles was neither rigid nor necessarily hereditary—which became a feature of the nobility under the British rule. Mughal monarchs rewarded their faithful servants and nobles with presents and vast estates but they were also very strict and

unscrupulous in confiscation. The ruler generally reacquired all the property on the death of a noble or servant. There was no stable aristocratic order and this stage of society was both advantageous and disadvantageous to the state, but on the whole it was the nobility which gave character to the state and not the state which gave form to nobility.

While the country was undergoing the pangs of disintegration events of world-wide importance were taking place on the other side of the world which proved of very great significance to the destinies of the country. Europe was developing certain powerful forces for outward expansion. It had recourse to that up till then unexploited source of world contact—the sea routes. The discovery of the Cape route by Vasco de Gama in 1498 was an event of world importance. It gave a new turn to the relations between the East and the West. After this the nature of the relationship was no longer merely commercial but also became political, social and cultural. The characteristic advance made by Europe at this stage was in what is known in the language of economics, "the management of money" and "the organization of trade". The opening of the sea routes made the world smaller and more manageable but less stable than ever before. The new trade was called 'the world trade' and the states interested in this trade became

'world powers'. In the subcontinent, European nations wanted trade as well as power; or we can say that they wanted trade initially but power was the natural consequence of richness in trade.

On the eve of European penetration, the subcontinent had much to offer to the world. It was a country which was not only self-sufficient under mediaeval conditions but was rich in many things, and had plenty of things to export to other countries. The industry of the country not only supplied all the local wants but also enabled it to export its finished products to foreign countries. "At a time when the West of Europe, the birth-place of the modern industrial system was inhabited by uncivilized tribes, India was famous for the wealth of her rulers, and for the high artistic skill of her craftsmen. Even at a much later period, when merchant adventurers from the West made their first appearance in India the industrial development of the country was at any rate not inferior to that of the more advanced European nations".[1] At that time the articles in which Europe was interested and which were imported were the articles of luxury to tickle the palate or to don the body. Silk, silk cloth, fine cotton, pearls, dyes, perfumes and incense were imported to satisfy aristo-

1. A report of the Industrial Commission 1918.

cratic and extravagant tastes, and spices were imported to give taste to the insipid food.

The Portuguese were the first European nation to interest themselves in exploits on the high seas prompted by the ideas of gold and African slaves. The Portuguese when they landed at Goa in 1545 are said to have declared that they had come to the East with the Cross in one hand and the Sword in the other—in a typical crusading spirit. The Muslims they considered their natural enemies, and all contact was established with the Hindus. They effected colonization by marriages and they allowed many privileges to converts to Christianity. They introduced the tobacco plant into the country in the seventeenth century and thereby created a great change in social life. Their settlements were generally full of adventurers of all nations; and they lived and revelled in piracy, highway robbery, and the slave trade. They committed all kinds of atrocities which made them a hated people. With the introduction of the Inquisition in Goa in 1560, they degraded Christianity in the eyes of the people. Their administration in the country was corrupt to the core and this was true of all their settlements in the East. It was said that the Portuguese governors were appointed in the first year, they robbed in the second and packed up in the third to sail away.

The Portuguese were soon ousted from eastern trade by the Dutch who entertained

great hostility against Spain because Portugal had allied itself with it. Dutch hostility to Portugal and Spain was due to national and religious reasons. Even English hostility against Spain and Portugal in the sixteenth century was due to religious differences. The policy of the Dutch in the East was much more commercial. They believed in colonization and settlement; and they had a strong tendency to establish monopoly in trade. The English learnt these lessons from the Dutch and advanced on territorial expansions. England and France came in the field more or less at the same time; and circumstances suggested that any one among them would never be able to carry on peaceful trade without the elimination of the other. It was also certain that the French who never learn lessons from history (the French nature is supposed to be essentially childish) must go under, and England should carry on undisputed activities in the country's trade. The elimination of France not only left England supreme in the country but made it possible for it to stand successfully against Napoleon.

The French were more brilliant and glamorous than sustained and steadfast. Dr. Fryer's impression of a French factory was "better stored with Monsieurs than cash; they live well, borrow money and make show". They had no definite policy to pursue and their entire work remained a

monument of the policy of fits and starts. Dupleix's was an unfortunate position with incompetent subordinates, jealous colleagues, ignorant and suspicious superiors who withheld resources and rewarded failure with disgrace. He was no match against Clive and Lawrence who had all the support of their countrymen in the country and in England, and they had the grateful country behind them not only to recognise their services but adequately reward them. Between 1746-1763 there was an almost constant conflict between the French and the English; and prognosticating from activities in the two camps the successful emergence of the latter was a foregone conclusion. Even in officious interference in indigenous affairs, though the French came in first, yet the permutations and combinations were more judiciously and cleverly manipulated by the English. The factors which gave final victory to England over France were leadership, finance, government and sea-power.

The first European contact with the subcontinent practically coincided with the beginning of the Mughal rule. When they came they found it one country and under one strong and powerful rule. Sir Thomas Roe who came in 1615 (in the reign of Jehangir) advised the East India Company (of which he was a representative) to avoid the mistakes of the Dutch and the Portuguese "who seek plantations here by sword", and he

emphatically put it down; "Let this be received as a rule that if you will profit seek it at sea and in quiet trade; for, without controversy, it is an error to effect garrisons and landways in India". But in spite of this warning by Roe, we have proof enough that the idea of territorial possession was ever present both in the minds of the Company in England and its servants in the country. In a letter of 1681 the Directors announced that "to establish such a policy of civil and military power, and to create and secure such a large revenue to maintain both, as may be the foundation of a large well-grounded, sure English dominion in India for all time to come, was something which they looked for". In the last quarter of the seventeenth century Sir Josiah Child took a bold step in that direction and the British had to suffer a lot of damage to their prestige and property. They further got a reprimand from Aurangzeb "to behave themselves for the future no more in such a shameful manner". Sir Josiah "whose appearance as a city merchant instead of Emperor of China or the great Mughal seems an error of providence, ascended his inadequate throne in Leaden Hall Street, and reigned despotically over the East India Company for the last twenty years of the seventeenth century"[1] was ordered to go back to England; but it had become clear that Roe's warning

1. Thompson and Garratt "The Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India."

was no longer seriously taken by the Company in England or by its servants in the subcontinent.

The history of the establishment of British rule in the subcontinent is replete with romance and adventure. A trading concern became the successor of the great Mughal empire and the very history and development of that commercial corporation is still full of romance and adventure. "Without a spark of patriotism, they set on the brow of England a gem of priceless value, without care for Christianity they paved the way for the overthrow of idolatry."

The East India Company began its activities after 31st December, 1600, when Queen Elizabeth granted the necessary Charter to "one body corporate and politic ....by name of the Governor and Company of merchants of London trading into the East India" and that "they at their own adventures, costs and charges, as well for the honour of this our realm of England, as for the increase of our navigation and advancement of trade of merchandize, with the said realm and the dominion of the same might adventure to set forth one or more voyages ....in the countries and parts of Asia and Africa....to the benefit of our Commonwealth". It was the adventurous spirit of the great queen and her hostility to Spain which prompted her to encourage such enter-

prises. In the very text of the charter it was pointed out that there was no element of religion in the institution of the company. It is said that the Company was formed as a result of the letters to his father written from the subcontinent by the English Jesuit Thomas Stevens who had fled away from England and settled there in 1579. The idea had taken root that the subcontinent was the land of fabulously rich potentates, "sitting on thrones of jewelled gold, riding forth to hunt with trains of 10,000 followers, on elephants caprisoned in velvet and brocade".[1] And thus came into existence the corporation of merchants to win an empire for the British people.

Initially the company carried on trade in a desultory way and for every voyage a separate capital was subscribed; and after the completion of a return voyage profit or loss was calculated and accounts were wound up. In 1609 the charter of the company was renewed and in 1612 it got built "goodly ships of such burthen as never were formerly used in merchandise". It abandoned the separate-voyage-system, and thus became a real sound joint stock concern. The company in the organization of its activities imitated the Dutch and where they settled they had a factory. The factory became the nucleus round which all activities

1. R. Muir "The Making of British India."

began to grow. In the words of Lord Palmerston "The original settler began with a factory, the factory grew into a fort, the fort expanded into a district, and the district into a province". The chief factory had a president and council appointed by the directors in England. The place where the president and his council resided was designated a presidency. Thus the three presidencies of Bombay, Madras and Bengal grew out of Surat, Fort St. George and Fort William respectively. These factories and forts had a great strategic importance. Situated at nodal points they were a great asset when active efforts for territorial aggrandisement commenced. Bombay on the West coast, Madras on the South and Calcutta on the East put the company in a favourable position to start (to put it in modern war terminology) a pincer movement to surround the weak powers and principalities left scattered about on the collapse of the Mughal empire. These presidencies were separate units with their own banks and organization. Later in January, 1921, the amalgamation of these banks gave rise to the 'Imperial Bank of India'. The presidencies had their separate armies as late as 1895 and it was after that, that these separate units were amalgamated under one command and called the 'Indian Army'. Initially all territorial acquisitions were assigned to one or the other presidency and it was after the Mutiny that the provinces began to take shape.

Interestingly enough, Bombay was the first piece of the country's soil to come under British sovereignty having been given in dowry by the King of Portugal to his sister married to Charles II. In 1668 Charles being badly in need of money gave it "in free and common soccage as of the manor of East Greenwich, on payment of an annual rent of £10 in gold, on the 30th December of each year."

It was a policy of the company that the men who worked for them were made to work in the factory areas and before the eyes of the officials. The factory was permitted an armed guard by the Mughal authorities but no permission for fortification was granted. It was near about 1740, when the Mughal rule had collapsed beyond recovery, that actual work of fortification was undertaken. The administration of the factory was organized under the general principle that only that law could be enforced which was "not repugnant to English Law." In Bombay a mint was established in 1676, but the coins had only local currency in the factory area, and could not go into circulation in the Mughal empire. Authority to issue Mughal coins was secured by the company in the eighteenth century. A post office for the factory was established in Bombay in 1688. The company's army consisted of all sorts of European elements, *e.g.*, deserters from European armies and the King's

army and navy were always there to help when the need arose. The first indigenous community to get into active collaboration with the company were the Parsis of Bombay presidency; and it is they who became not only a highly commercial and industrial community but conspicuously urban and Europeanised too. The next to deal with the British traders were the shrewd Hindus who had not much attachment left to the Muslim rule then supreme. The officials of the company realised these weaknesses and tried to make use of these to their trade advantages. With the collapse of Arab trade and the elimination of their sea faring activities, the European companies must have realized the value and importance of Hindu collaboration in internal matters, and knew that they would readily join them in profit-making. There was as yet no concrete and solid cohesive sentiment among the Hindus though it was there in rudimentary stages; and it was in them, as a commercial class, that the British found dependable and convenient supporters. Thus among the Hindus was created the impression and even confidence that their interests were identical with those of the British. Thus the Hindus began to work as willing agents of the British who granted them comparatively better privileges and let them enjoy subordinate power in their administration.

The subcontinent became a battle field in the struggle between France and England for supremacy in the world. In the Indian Ocean, France began with superior strategic advantages whereas on Indian soil England was much stronger. Dupleix, the French Governor, had conceived the idea that the safest course to gain an upper hand in the internal affairs would be to acquire supremacy under local potentates and princes, and then count on their help and support against England. In Dupleix's policy towards the princes we find the germs of the future policy of the paramount power, *e. g.* the subsidiary system of Lord Wellesley, and the policies of Lapse and Annexation of Lord Dalhousie. It was to Dupleix that England owed the birth of the Indian army. It was the French who as a matter of policy began the system of alliances with the local princes, and it was they who first trained indigenous soldiers in European methods of warfare and initiated tactical changes with their help. These ideas which the French initially conceived were advantageously applied by Clive and Lawrence. Fortunately for the English they had a promising young man in their clerical staff who seemed to be better acquainted with the use of the sword and the efficacy of diplomacy than with the use of the pen; and he in the words of Burke "settled great foundations, he forded a deep river with bottom unknown". Clive clearly prognosticated the consequences of the French advance

policy—in his efforts to thwart the French designs he became the pioneer of British rule in the subcontinent.

The period from 1707 to 1773 was that of 'Great Anarchy'. There was no law, no authority, no morality and no organised effort of any kind. History records the interesting spectacle of petty potentates running mad to catch any straw that would save them from nemesis which was gaping at them to overwhelm them. Even princes of the imperial house lost all balance of mind and frequently had recourse to frantic manipulations, to conspiracies and to mischief. The entire life presented sinister and ominous forebodings. On the condition of the subcontinent : Sir J. W. Kay commented, "In India every war is more or less popular. The constitution of Anglo-Indian society renders it almost impossible that it should be otherwise".[1] There was no organised army anywhere and the country stood perfectly exposed and vulnerable to anyone who could command one. "Often the fate of India depended on a single army; often again may the fate of a great part of India depend on a single army" was the considered opinion of Metcalfe.[2] The British got ready to organise one.

During this period of anarchy (in April 1757) the destinies of Bengal fell into the

1. Thompson "The Making of the Indian Princes."
2. H. Lawrence "Essays Political and Military."

hands of Nawab Sirajudaulah, an inexperienced but brave youngman. Robert Clive with his consummate skill, diplomacy and dexterity was able to turn the scales in favour of the British in the Battle of Plassey which followed soon after the Nawab's succession. This decisive victory, at once put the great East India Company on the path to become successor to the Mughal empire. Though a kind of *de jure* British rule was still to come a *de facto* authority was established. The Company began to acquire the position of a native power. Nay, the result of the Battle of Plassey did not merely mean change in the Nawab but the destruction of the authority of the premier Nawab of the Mughal empire. The outcome of the battle suggested which way the wind was blowing. The Battle of Plassey marks a stage after which no serious European rival was left for England to face in the subcontinent, but its troubles essentially lay on the continent of Europe. While Clive was effecting his great victory in the East, in the year 1761, Ahmad Shah was clearing ground for the British at the Battle of Panipat. He broke the Marhatta confederacy to pieces and left them small irreconcilable states which could be easily and at leisure manipulated and brought under control by the British. As more than once before had happened, the empire was being restored by an outside power—this time a non-Asiatic and a European power. Thus began that strange association between

countries so dissimilar, so remote from one another in history and traditions—an association which brought about profound changes in the internal and international situation of the two countries.

Thus the West came in contact with the subcontinent first through the Portuguese, then the Dutch, the French and the British traders and adventurers. The history of the eighteenth century, and the first quarter of the nineteenth, is to a great extent that of the contests and struggles for supremacy of these traders from the West and of the varying co-operation they received in the country, in their support. "The great companies of the seventeenth century were the champions and delegated agents of their respective nations in the competition for commerce and territory throughout the whole non-Christian world".[1] The three European nations which came to the country besides the British left few or hardly any marks of their influence. The Portuguese with all the romantic bravery they displayed were rapacious, unsystematic and unsympathetic; the Dutch were actuated by a selfish commercial policy; the French were governed by meteoric vain ambitions. They all had weaknesses which militated against their efforts for any permanent influence. The British learnt lessons from the failure and the

1. A. Lyall "Asiatic Studies."

mistakes of the European nations and from the success of the Mughal institutions. They became not only politically supreme but drew the entire country's society under their Western influences.

Turning to the affairs of the company we find that soon after the Battle of Plassey "the position in which the British agents found themselves was such as to present terrible temptations to men whose sole purpose in India was the making of profit; and who were paid absurdly small salaries and who now found that the whole trade and population of a huge province lay at their mercy". It was a sad state of affairs. The Company had acquired power without responsibilities of administration of the provinces. It neither ruled itself nor allowed the local princes to rule. Misrule, corruption and all kinds of malpractices not only continued unchecked but increased even more. The entire position was made worse by European traders indulging in most irresponsible private trading. The servants of the company moved about like bullies and made extravagant demands for presents from the puppet rulers and people of the province. They knew that the company was real master and the local rulers were mere figure-heads; consequently, as Sheridan put it, "they wielded a truncheon with one hand and picked the pocket with the other". When Clive came to the country a second time

he described "the scene of anarchy, confusion, bribery, corruption and extortion", and pathetically wrote that "Alas, how is the English name sunk. I could not avoid paying the tribute of a few tears to the departed and lost fame of the British nation".

The Company's servants amassed money by all means fair and foul, and on returning to England became a pest to English society. It is said money is power and power corrupts and these "Indian Nabobs" were corrupt to the core. English society stood in danger of collapsing due to the activities of these Nabobs. They practised bribery and corruption on a scale which shocked even the prototypes of their age in England. Eighteenth century English life provides very interesting material to prove the degeneration in public spirit and the chaos in social life. There were masters of political managements who believed that every person had a price. When attempts were made to bring the control of the affairs and administration of the Company into the hands of the Parliament the object of the ruling classes in England was to widen the scope of patronage, nepotism and corruption. In 1770 Pitt the Elder declared "The riches of Asia have been poured upon us and have brought with them not only Asiatic luxury but, I fear Asiatic principles of government. Without connexions, without any natural interest in the soil, the importers of foreign gold have forced their way

into Parliament by such a torrent of private corruption as no private hereditary fortune can resist". Sheridan declared "the Indian Phalanx, those Swiss guards of Eastern population, had only declared they would overthrow the last administration; nay, these Eastern lords went so far as to declare they could carry any point by money". The typical Nabob of the time was General Smith whom Lord Macaulay described as "an Anglo-Indian chief, dissolute, ungenerous and tyrannical, ashamed of the humble friends of his youth, hating the aristocracy yet childishly eager to be numbered among them, squandering his wealth on panders and flatterers, tucking out chairmen with most costly hot-house flowers, and astounding the ignorant with jargon about rupees, lacs and jaghirs".

The false conception that the subcontinent was an inexhaustible reservoir of wealth and riches was soon exploded. The Company being a private concern did not feel responsible for the internal social and economic development, and all revenues were looked upon as private profit of the share-holders. These revenues were used to purchase local goods for sale in England and for export to other countries. The old principle that "business is business" when it worked under the protection of military prowess actually meant that personal aggrandisement and vagaries must be free and unhampered. In 1787 the verdict

of Charles Grant, an important director of the Company and a great Englishman of his time was that "the country and the people were not in so good a condition as that in which we found them....the history of our rule in Bengal is in great part a history of our errors".

Thus was the subcontinent disintegrating (a property of everybody and responsibility of nobody) leaving chaos in its trail, not only in the country itself but in England too.

. 3 .

WANING CRESCENT AND WAXING CROSS

The century preceding the Mutiny of 1857, was characterised by perpetual unrest in the country and steady expansion of the Company's dominions. Though on the whole the character of the administration remained of the happy-go-lucky sort and "alike in the political and military line, could be observed auctioneering Ambassadors and trading Generals; and thus one saw a revolution brought about by affidavits, an army employed in executing an arrest, a town besieged by a note of hand, a prince dethroned for the balance of an account",[1] yet it was during this period that the fundamentals of British policy in the subcontinent were formulated.

The victory of Wandewash in 1760 was a decisive one for England and a crushing blow for France. From that time on British

1. Sheridan 7th October 1785 on the "Affairs of the East India Company."

supremacy stood in danger from the people of the country only, even though the British had to stand some very hard days and received some very bad knocks in America and on the continent, (We must bear in mind that Anglo-French rivalry of the period was of great significance to the country and it remains the keynote of the history of British rule from 1794—1819). In 1779 emerged a very formidable and potential combination of three important rulers—the Marhattas, who were already engaged in fighting with the Company—Hyder Ali, the new and greats oldier in the South later followedby h is son Tipu Sultan, and the Nizam, the timid and pusillanimous ruler left on the local scene. This was the gravest year in the life of the Company. Any success of this combination should have proved disastrous for British supremacy in the country. This league itself, was a league of strange bedfellows brought into existence as a result of the French influence in local courts—the French had now left the active field but were busy playing a mischievous part behind the curtain.

During this period followed in quick succession a number of Governors-General who not only consolidated British rule in the country but left it territorially supreme. This is a period of *de facto* British authority in the country. The first to save the fate of British rule was Warren Hastings. His greatness is to be judged by the troubles he was beset

with—an irreconcilable group of Council members, the moral depravity of British society in the country and the intrigues that went along with it; and on top of all it was he who had to face the local rulers among whom a consciousness of the expanding power of the Company was growing and who wanted to stop that process. With all his handicaps he proved equal to every occasion. When it became impossible for him to carry on in office he resigned (1785) and left behind not only safe possessions for the Company, but also indelible marks on their administration. The general lines which he laid down for the military, political, revenue and administrative machinery became the basis on which the future structure of British administration in the country was completed. He understood and sympathised with the people and believed that "if the British power in India was to be lasting it must become an Indian power". It was strange that he had a sad lot at the hands of his colleagues and countrymen in the country, and stranger still that he was so mercilessly treated in after years regardless of the services he had rendered to his country and to his nation. Warren Hastings seems to have been the only person so treated, whereas more mistakes were committed by much lesser men who went scot-free. The human and tragic side of his life combined with his love affair and impeachment make a very fascinating reading.

Warren Hastings was followed by Lord Cornwallis whom Pitt regarded as "an infallible cure for all ills". He thought that England must behave and remain in the country a Western power and not a local power. In view of his ideas he carried out certain changes in policy with very far reaching consequences. He died in the country and according to his instructions "where the tree falls let it lie" he was buried there.

Cornwallis was followed by a dynamic personality in Lord Wellesley who by 1800 had made sufficient efforts to advance the process of putting the map of the country as it was found at the time of Partition. Wellesley came to the country very young (37 years) and with great ideas which he carried through regardless of consequences and in direct defiance of the commercial policy of the Company. He directly meddled in the internal affairs of the local rulers; and his "Subsidiary System" was a very bold and firm step to put an end to "vexatious and painful interruption of tranquillity". He made the local rulers acknowledge the supremacy of the authority of the Company and thereby advanced the principle of paramountcy in the country. In the pursuit of his policy he was able to eliminate the most dangerous of the local rulers, and the foremost among them was Tipu Sultan on whose defeat and death in 1799 Marriot commented: "The death of Tipu Sultan removed from the

Indian scene the most inveterate, the most implacable, and the most fanatical, perhaps the most formidable enemy encountered by the Company in its contests with the native powers in India".[1]

Ambitious Wellesley (he is said to have called himself a tiger) was very much disappointed in his reward by Lord Granville. He was doing everything to secure the Order of the Garter whereas he was conferred an Irish Marquisate on which he expressed his "anguish of mind" because "there has been nothing Irish or Pinchbeck in my conduct or in its results. I felt an equal confidence that I should find nothing Irish or Pinchbeck in my reward".

Lord Hastings (1813—23) was a successor to the policy of Wellesley. He put the authority of the Company on a sounder footing and made it look the only strong power in the country. Though he had many wars to wage, yet he was wise enough not to neglect the administration of the vast dominions. By 1823 it was definitely proved that British diplomacy backed by military power was eminently successful in subordinating all the local rulers and making them conscious of their subordinate position. The administration of Lord William Bentinck (1828—35) marks a turning point in the Indo-British

1. "The English in India."

relation. For the first time the administration took active interest in social and educational problems. The suppression of Sati was an instance of the former and of the latter was the recognition of English as a language to be taught in schools and colleges. It was finally decided that English education alone would have official support and on the encouragement of this alone, as far as possible, educational finance shall be expanded. These decisions that were taken in his regime proved to be great revolutionary steps. Lord Macaulay paying tribute to his work said, he "infused into oriental despotism the spirit of British freedom; who abolished cruel rites, who effaced humiliating distinctions; who gave liberty to the expression of public opinion, whose constant study it was to elevate the intellectual and moral character of the nations committed to his charge".

Lord Dalhousie (1848—56) was another officious, pugnacious and dynamic Governor-General. He stood midway between Wellesley and Curzon in time, in character and in policy. He, with his masterly strokes tried to ring out the old and ring in the new. He generated forces which were bound to prove troublesome for his successors. He introduced changes which were bound to be misunderstood and create suspicion. Coming to preside on the destinies of the subcontinent at the young age of 35, he brought a certain vigour in the administration which proved

very alarming. He was obsessed by thoughts and schemes even in his sleep, and would not mind writing to his private secretary at midnight "if you are up and have breaches on come here; if not come without them". He put down on record his "strong and deliberate opinion that the British government is bound not to put aside or neglect such rightful opportunities of acquiring territory as may from time to time present themselves". His "Doctrine of Lapse" and "Policy of Annexation" gave him many frequent opportunities to put his programme into effect. By 1856 even "the peaceful" territorial expansions of British rule in the country was over. The circumstances had ended in which English expansion was supposed to "have been forced by imperious necessity into onward march, where the greatest difficulty is to know where to stop."[1] From that time on it was the relations with the local states (as Indian rulers had emerged) which were to be regulated. The subcontinent was conquered, and now it was to be kept under control. One more futile, and mad but justifiable—perhaps unavoidable—struggle in 1857 and the country collapsed in frustration and gloom of peace for nearly three quarters of a century.

It must be marked that British rule in the subcontinent was successfully established as a result of internal dissensions and chaos

1. Ronaldshay "India—a Birds' Eye View."

as well as due to the necessary consequences of the struggle that was decided on the continent. Writing about the annexations of Dalhousie, Prof. Ramsay Muir says, "The last important stage of British advance in India was influenced by European politics; just as Wellesley's conquests had been the outcome of Napolean's ambitions; and as the first British successes in the Carnatic and Bengal had followed from the world-wide rivalry of France and England in the middle of the eighteenth century."[1]

British rule could never have been established in the subcontinent if the country were one nation or a group of nations united in a common cause and common resistance. Until the country was so united or certain groups were so formed the question was who should be the successor to the Mughal heritage and certainly circumstances internal and external suggested and made it convenient and favourable for England to step in.

The Company tried to maintain the policy of neutrality but even during the regime of Lord Cornwallis, "The unavoidable inconvenience of the system of neutrality" was recognised. The Company wavered and vacillated even when persons like Metcalfe wrote "sovereigns you are, and as such must act". It was an interesting feature of the

---

1. "The Making of British India."

British policy of non-intervention that in spite of all the efforts to maintain it, Britain always found itself fully active and in the midst of troubles it had always tried to avoid. The stage of intervention begins when non-intervention begins "to be inconvenient". Lord Wellesley and Lord Dalhousie threw the policy of non-intervention and neutrality to the winds and frequently indulged not in "negotiating but dragooning"[1] because inactivity and neutrality generally "created situations of extreme danger to power and prestige". They waged all wars in order to keep "The evils of war.....at a distance from the sources of our wealth and our power". All this vigour and activity of the administrators at once made England master of the country. We cannot deny that there was much truth in the assertion that British statesmen and businessmen did not foresee and still less design and shape either the empire or the commonwealth. It seemed that fortune disproportionately favoured Britain compared to its home-territory and the strength of its population. Townsend tells us that British rule in the subcontinent was a miracle.[2]

The Act of 1784 which subjected the administration of the Company to parliamentary control contained a clause that "to pursue schemes of conquest and extension

1. H. Lawrence "Essays Political and Military."

2. "Asia and Europe."

of dominion in India are measures repugnant to the wish, the honour and the policy of this nation". The first to repudiate this clause was Wellesley and more followed in quick succession. Thirst for money, hunger for distinction, and love of glory created an urge for romance and adventure—England was making 'Romantic Imperialism' a present to the world.

We cannot deny this, too, that there were in those times no fewer excuses for altruistic interference, philanthropic extermination and humanitarian excruciations. If the English administrators had the interests of the masses at heart and their efforts were aimed to realise "hopes of great improvements affecting the conditions of millions"—there was no doubt that their lot was miserable—the masses hardly knew what was good for them. It was under avowed noble feelings like Wellesley's "I can declare my honest conviction that no greater blessing can be conferred on the native inhabitants of India than the extension of British authority"; that territorial expansion was resorted to. In England the second quarter of the nineteenth century was a period of Catholic emancipation, parliamentary reform, abolition of slavery and of liberalism. It was a part of the humanitarian movement of the time that the subcontinent was considered a 'Trust' for the welfare of its peoples. There was visible alongside the "anxiety to understand

and make the best use of Indian traditions" the equally "strong conviction that it was the duty of the British Government to introduce into India the best results of Western civilization". To persons like Wilberforce it meant an opportunity for admitting to a heathen land—"The genial influence of Christian light and truth". British rule was supposed to be a salvation of the indigenous peoples from the indigenous despotism. James Mill rejoiced at "valuing the feelings of millions more than individuals". It cannot be denied that it was not the military and ethical argument alone which justified expansion, but the circumstances of the time too made it possible, nay, in many cases dictated various activities. Any other method of behaviour on the part of Britain would have been at its own peril, and as it was, the causes of expansion were beyond its control. It was natural that the two systems could not, and it was desirable that they should not, simultaneously exist—and as the circumstances would have it, the indigenous system was bound to be eclipsed and go under, and play a part assigned to it by the superior system.

Whatever the efforts that were made in the country to turn the tide of events and to save what remained, were efforts rather too late. The weaker party did try to put in the effort either in over-confidence or in absolute desperation to avoid its fate but now all

challenge was futile and doomed to disappointment and failure. By the middle of the nineteenth century we find the entire country in perfect British control. The last of the provinces like Sind, Punjab and Assam too went down either through the mad intoxication with power of their rulers or due to the working of the universal law that the fittest must survive and the weak go under. This biological truth at this stage had become a principle of politics too. The conqueror of Sind, Sir Charles Napier, wrote "We have no right to seize Sind yet we shall do so, a very advantageous, useful and humane piece of rascality it will be". Major Outram (one of the finest British officers whom Napier himself rightly called 'The Bayar of India') felt aggrieved at the "the most tyrannical measure and positive robbery"; and he wrote to Sir Charles, "I am sick of policy; and I will not say yours is the best but it is undoubtedly the shortest—that of the sword". The annexation of the Punjab in 1849 closed the period of military conquests—there being no part left to conquer —all futher extension of British rule was simple peaceful accretion to British territory already conquered.

If in the eighteenth century the subcontinent could be called 'Masterless', in the first half of the nineteenth century it could be rightly designated a precarious British possession. The sure and steady development of British rule during this period is unique

in world annals. With the commencement of this period territorial expansion had hardly begun but the end of it saw the British booted and spurred to ride on a horse saddled and bridled to be ridden. Due to many petty wars and skirmishes Britain found itself in the midst of local troubles and the final result was that it became the paramount power, and to all intents and purposes sat in the seat of the Mughal Empire.

Thus was created the problem of the "Indian States" and there came in vogue in political terminology the words "Indian India". Though this system was not entirely planned or premeditated, yet it cannot be described as purely accidental. When British power in the country was waxing certain parts of the country were left blank and those were called the 'Indian States'. "We have never seized a whole country at once, but have always left an independent state remaining, under which those who are discontented with our government might find a refuge"[1] was the opinion of Mountstuart Elphinstone. The blank (independent as Elphinstone calls them) parts so encompassed by British territory that a recalcitrant prince would find himself gagged and throttled in the very initial attempt to make a mischievous move. Practical exigencies of the period of expansion and expediencies of

1. Thompson "Making of the Indian Princes."

the moment suggested that in order to strengthen the British position in the land of strife, the most convenient and inexpensive method to adopt would be to purchase the alliance of a convenient impotent weakling, or to win over a possible dangerous foe or to prop up an unstable small chief by undertaking to respect and protect his pseudo-dynastic rights and sham privileges from internal dangers and external encroachments. "We must have a sink to receive all corrupt matter that abounds in India, unless we are willing to taint our own system by stopping the discharge of it,"[1] was the outspoken view of Elphinstone. The treaties, Sanads and engagements were simple devices to create an ostensible halo round the state rights and to give the rulers of these states a false sense of importance and prestige, whereas no one more than the paramount power knew the hollowness and uselessness of these documents and understandings. In course of development these quasi-treaties and pseudo-engagements were qualified by "usage and sufferance" which reduced every power and all authority of the rulers of the states, sham as they already were, to zero. Sir Thomas Munro had given warnings that by following this policy the rulers of states were being demoralized and made not only weak and pusillanimous but oppressive, cruel and indolent.

---

1. Thompson "Making of the Indian Princes."

The policy of neutrality and non-intervention with regard to the princes was pursued at convenience so long as they continued to pay a fixed tribute to the Company. Sir Charles Metcalfe wrote to Lord Hastings "we ought to draw forth new resources and if these be impracticable within our own dominion we must look to increase of territory by conquest over our enemies in the interior of India. There is no doubt that opportunities will rise for effecting such conquests....to enlarge our territories in the interior of India on every occasion of war ....to apply the next revenues of conquered countries to the maintenance of additional force, and the acquisition of additional force to the achievement of new conquests thus growing in size and increasing in strength as we proceed, until we can safely determine to confine ourselves within fixed limits, and abjure all further conquests."[1] The policy of non-intervention was officially abandoned in 1841, when the British administration announced its intention to "persevere in the clear and directed course of abandoning no just and honourable accessions of territory and revenue, while all existing claims of right are at the same time scrupulously respected." "The lapse of subordinate states by the failure of heirs natural where the succession can be sustained only by sanction of

1. Thompson and Garratt "Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India."

government being given to the ceremony of adoption according to the Hindu law" was a convenient enunciation of policy by Dalhousie to effect annexations. This tendency of annexation went so far that even Sir Charles Wood was forced to write in 1854 that "I am by no means impatient to absorb all these states, though I suppose it will come to this in the end."

The purpose of maintaining these mediaeval princedoms had been aptly and realistically described by a few administrators. In 1825 Sir John Malcolm wrote "I am decidedly of the opinion that the tranquillity, not to say the security, of our vast oriental possessions is involved in the preservation of native principalities which are dependent on us for protection. These are also so obviously at our mercy, so entirely within our grasp that besides their co-existence with our rule is of itself a source of political strength, the value of which will never be known till it is lost."[1] Col. Sleeman went further and emphasised "The native states are considered to be breakwaters and when all are swept away we shall be left at the mercy of our native army which may not be always under control."

The theoretical position of the states in relation to the British Government was first defined by Lord Hastings. He expressly put

1. Pannikar "Indian States".

it down that his policy was "to render British Government paramount in effect if not declaredly so, to hold other states as vassals though not in name; to oblige them in return for our guarantee of their position, to perform the two feudatory duties of supporting our rule with all their forces and submitting their mutual difference to our arbitration." Finally in the regime of Dalhousie all those rulers, who were no longer in a mood of sobriety and reality to retain what they possessed and who were many a time rather an exasperation than a strength to the administration and with whose elimination the administration stood to gain both territorially and financially, were taken away from the political scene. By the time the Queen's Proclamation in 1858 officially announced renunciation of the policy of annexation and promised maintenance of the "ancient rights, usages and customs of India" a lot had been achieved and made permanent. Sir Henry Maine commenting on this political structure said, "There may be found in India every shade and variety of sovereignty but there is only one independent sovereign, the British Government. The mode and degree in which sovereignty is distributed between the British Government and any native state is always a question of fact which has to be separately decided in each case and to which no general rules apply."[1]

1. J. Cumming "Political India."

Thus was introduced a new and strange conception of sovereignty. Political vocabulary stood enriched by the emergence of the "state system", but the system itself stood condemned on all grounds of public good, social happiness and moral life. The notorious pusillanimity of the state rulers in relation to the paramount power was vastly due to the superior military strength of the latter, whereas it was on military might of the paramount power that the states stood propped up against the peoples of the country. That the system was rotten to the core was true beyond any shadow of doubt, and a President of the Indian States Peoples' Conference declared that "the majority were sinks of reaction, incompetence and unrestricted autocratic power sometimes exercised by vicious and degraded individuals." And even a conservative paper like the *Times* could not hide the fact that "we have emancipated these pale ineffectual pageants of royalty from the ordinary fate that awaits an oriental despotism....It has been well said that we give these princes power without responsibility. Our hand of iron maintains them on the Throne despite their imbecility, their vices and their crimes. The result is in most of the states a chronic anarchy, under which the revenues of the states are dissipated between the mercenaries of the camp and the minions of the court. The heavy and arbitrary taxes

levied on the miserable peasants serve only to feed the meanest and the most degraded of mankind. The theory seems in fact admitted that the government is not for the people but the people for the king; and that so long as we secure the King his sinecure royalty, we discharge all the duty that we as sovereigns of India, owe to his subjects who are virtually ours."

The *de facto* British authority in the country was reaching a climax. Sir Henry Lawrence declared, "we can now, therefore, afford to be pacific—but we can not afford to be weak. We have no occasion to put forth our strength; but we must not suffer ourselves to waste it. We must keep ourselves up to the athletic standard"[1]. Sir John Malcolm was afraid of trends of negligence in the administration and warned "our present condition is one of apparent repose but full of danger"[2]. Perhaps none was more competent to predict the shape of things to come and future troubles that might break out than Lord Dalhousie himself who, while leaving the country in 1856, wrote that he looked forward to "a happy record of peace, prosperity and progress," but simultaneously bluntly put it down that "No prudent man having any knowledge of Eastern affairs would even venture to predict a pro-

1. "Essays Political and Military."
2. Thompson "Making of the Indian Princes."

longed continuance of peace in India" and he emphasised that "we are perfectly secure so long as we are strong and are believed to be so". Still less than Dalhousie had his successor any illusions of his post. Lord Canning in a speech at the farewell banquet in England declared "I wish for a peaceful term of office. But I cannot forget that in the sky of India, serene as it is, a small cloud may rise, no longer than a man's hand, but which growing larger and larger, may at last threaten to burst and overwhelm us with ruin."[1]

Soon followed the most significant events in the history of the subcontinent. They proved that upto the time Dalhousie left, the country's belief in the strength of British power was not universal; and the Mutiny was the consequence. "It is the hour", wrote Sir John Malcolm, "in which men awake from the dream. Disgust and discontent succeed to terror and admiration; and the princes, the chiefs and all who enjoyed rank or influence, see nothing but a system dooming them to immediate decline and ultimate annihilation...The same classes of men do not fill the same places in society under our government as they did under a native prince; nor are men actuated by similar motives. Our administration, though just, is cold and rigid. If it creates no alarm, it

1. W. Hunter "Indian Empire."

inspires little, if any, confidence and emulation. The people are protected, but not animated or attached. It is rare that any native of India living under it can suffer injury or wrong; but still more rare that he can be encouraged or elevated by favour of distinction. Our rules and regulations constitute a despotic power."[1] Turning to the military aspect and analysing the entire situation Sir Henry Lawrence cautioned that "Present rules cannot last. They are against nature. Ninety in a hundred sepoys have every reason to be delighted with the service. Several of the remaining ten are satisfied. One, two or three are thoroughly and dangerously discontended. The reason is plain. They feel they have that in them which elsewhere would raise them to distinction."[2]

The Mutiny of 1857 was the simple reflex action of a decapitated frog. All the cataclysmic changes that had taken place with such bewildering succession had done more to alarm and create suspicion than favourably to influence and create confidence. At the very outset to any disinterested spectator there were sufficient convincing proofs of its failure. The Mutiny was a purely military revolt; all social and religious causes were of secondary importance. The

1. Thompson and Garratt "Rise and Fufilment of British Rule in India."
2. "Essays Military and Political."

big conflagration was ignited on excuses based upon, and importance attached to, the very things which at that time had lost all importance and significance. Subversion of faith was a clumsy excuse—there was hardly any faith left in the different communities. Overseas service and greased cartridges were convenient excuse to inflame the masses and excite them to fury. The very shortness of the episode demonstrated that these were clumsy pretexts to have thrown the country, as a whole, into this fire. The entire mischief was manoeuvred and engineered by a few dispossessed rulers, and they took advantage of the still strong romantic sentiments of the people for the Mughal Empire. Due to personal grievances individuals began to incite the people. There existed all kinds of discontented elements in the country, *e.g.*, the discontented princes, disappointed rulers, the greedy placemen and the people who had been reduced to no importance in this revolution in life and government. The Mutiny was an attempt by these men to try their luck if they could succeed by such an effort. The reaction of one civilization against the other was no real cause. Strangely enough those parts of the country and sections of the population where English influence was greatest remained calm and peaceful. The contrast between the attitude of the people of Delhi and Oudh desiring expulsion of the British, and the attitude of the English-educated Bengalis desiring introduction of

English Education, was pointed out by Sir Charles Trevelyan nearly fifteen years before the outbreak of the Mutiny. Many parties which joined in mutually sympathetic cause were mere strange bed-fellows. There was nothing like an ideological unanimity among them. To call the Mutiny a national movement or a war of independence would be a misnomer. The Mutineers were divided in their aims. Their foremost leader, the Rani of Jhansi, was fighting for the restoration of Marhatta rule, while the Muslim soldiery aimed at the resuscitation of the Mughal Empire. The princes who escaped Dalhousie's axe remained loyal. The Sikhs, recently vanquished, stood by the British. The Gurkhas initially won over by Lord Hastings, and later pleased by Dalhousie, remained peaceful. The Afghans, thanks to the policy of Dalhousie in relation to those troublesome people, remained calm. The Mutiny was bound to end the way it did—an abortive attempt by the Mutineers.

The Mutiny was a painful episode, but it certainly swept the sky clear of all clouds. Discontent was natural under an alien rule. Lord Lawrence spoke the truth when he said that "the people of India can never forget that we are alien race in respect of colour, religion, habits and sympathies". It was not a matter of this deficiency or that but the entire system of British administration that created widespread suspicion. "Foreign

conquerors have treated the natives with violence, and often with great cruelty, but none had treated them with so much scorn as we; none have stigmatized the whole people as unworthy of trust, as incapable of honesty, and as fit to be employed only where we cannot do without them. It seems to be not only ungenerous, but impolitic, to debase the character of a people under our dominion", was an opinion expressed by Munro long ago in a letter to his friends. The traditional leaders of the country both religious and secular, recoiled against the system which mortified them and reduced their influence; the common man found the new system to all intents and purposes militating against his traditional ways. The Mutiny was a revolt of the old order against the new—the pangs of birth were bound to be acute. This climax was the natural result of the march of events of the past one hundred and fifty years. Such an outbreak was possible only when there was no local power left to dispute outside supremacy. Dalhousie's administration had irrevocably demonstrated British supermacy. The people were roused on grounds of false sentiments which were bound to give way, even if temporarily successful. During the catastrophe, it was acknowledged by every chronicler of the Mutiny, more indigenous blood was actually shed for the maintenance of the British rule than for its overthrow. It was a war between two systems, one mediae-

val and the other modern. The Mutiny at once made the people conscious of their weaknesses; and it left the country receptive for the sowing of seed, and, well fitted for the germination of new ideas—this trial of strength at some state was bound to come.

The Mutiny proved that the people of the subcontinent did not value the problems of the country with common objects in view. It at once demonstrated, that there were much more intrinsic differences in the country than appeared to an onlooker. Among the many causes which contributed to the outbreak of the Mutiny, might also be put down the deterioration in the sentiment of loyalty to the Company in the Army and in the people. It was even suggested that the Crimean War too contributed to its outbreak. Whatever it be, this trial of strength and the time at which it came (perhaps it could not have come earlier or later) between the old static order and new vigorous one, could have been avoided only by the wisdom, farsightedness and physical capacity beyond the scope of anyone. Thus, at least for the time being, the irresistible power of British authority was fully displayed, and the people began to think on different lines to achieve what they wanted. The Mutiny, though initially a purely military revolt, subsequently began to assume some form of a war of independence in the minds of the people. When it was put down, it eminently gave an

impression of such a war ended. Though there were no sound political reasons behind it at its outbreak; yet political consciousness, a bit of retrospection, and introspection became noticeable after it. G. O. Trevelyan tells us that much of good blood was split and much of hot blood remained behind.

Nought remains,

But vindictiveness here amid the strong,

And there amid the weak an impotent rage.

There is no doubt that the Mutiny was a tragedy of the first magnitude; but simultaneously it carried certain signs of relief, purification and peace. A historian of the Mutiny has affirmed that "perhaps a more fortunate occurrence than the Mutiny of 1857 never occurred in India." The inherent soundness of the country to carry on a struggle was tested and it was found wanting. Bengal, where English education was most widespread and the South, where missionary work was most active remained unaffected by this effervescence. After the Mutiny British authority stood unchallenged and supreme. The struggle of the decadent order to avoid the inevitable doom was over. The Mutiny at once made the people forget the past for a few decades and be busy in the present and also start thinking about the future.

A few funereal words on the tragic death and the sad burial of the Mughal Empire would not be out of place. Up to this time the Mughal Emperor remained the *de jure* sovereign of the country. He was shown all the ostensible reverence both by the indigenous rulers and the British administrators. Though throughout this period the Company was exercising its authority as a "king-maker" on a very large scale and the Emperor was growing more and more a figure-head—the empire was contracting round him to the four walls of his chamber even threatening to get narrower still—yet the old halo round him still continued. The predatory Marhattas were proud of the titles conferred on them by the Mughal Emperor and they usually acted in his name. As late as 1818 *Nazr* (a kind of tribute by a vassal to his lord) was paid to him by the Company. Till 1835 all coins were struck in his name. From the historical point of view, few Mughal weaklings are worth mentioning. A profligate descendant of that glorious dynasty was Mohammad Shah during whose reign the country was badly jolted and throttled by the invasion of Nadir Shah, which made confusion in the country worse confounded. Shah Alam II had a miserable lot. He was possessed like a museum specimen of curiosity in different hands till death cut short his misery. The last representative of that illustrious house of Temur was Bahadur Shah II, the tragic figure of the Mutiny. Indeed the

history of the Orient in the words of Gibbon has been "a perpetual round of valour, greatness, discord, degeneracy and decline".

Very interestingly the Mughal dynasty commenced with the accomplished military skill and perfect literary prose style of Babar and ended with the heart-rending poetry of pathos, and utter administrative incompetence of Bahadur Shah. The change of rulers and the revolution in government was complete. Sir George Schuster commenting on the new phase that began wrote, "slowly from now the British had to establish themselves as the real successors of Mughal rule in India. As then, the empire was to be part feudal and part bureaucratic; as then, the focus of political interest was the Court; as then, espionage was respected and an indispensable means of government: as then, the Court was magnificent, extravagant and except in the collection of revenue, aloof from the common people; as then, the life of the monarch was poisoned by fear and suspicion".[1]

Simultaneously with the Mughal Empire another great institution was buried alive. The Mutiny put an end to two great sovereign institutions—the *de jure* Mughal sovereignty and the *de facto* sovereign corporation.

The East India Company interested

---

1. "India and Democracy."

itself in peaceful and prosperous trade upto 1744 and only occasionally took interest in local politics. It had amassed so much wealth and power that it was forbidden to do banking business, and thereby become rival to the Bank of England. Burke declared that, "The constitution of the Company began in commerce and ended in empire—in fact the East India Company in India is a state in the disguise of a merchant." In 1857 (a hundred years after the battle of Plassey) a tribute was paid to this corporation. "It was necessary for the conquest of Hindustan that the East India Company could exist; for it is only the intense greediness of traders that could have won for us the sovereignty of the country." But in spite of all the huge profits it was making and the power it was accumulating the Company could not cope with the internal ills that had crept into it. Private trading had become the order of the day, against which all administrators protested. Warren Hastings himself realised "the oppressions committed, under the sanction of the English name and through the want of spirit in the Nawabs subjects to oppose them"[1]. Gradually the affairs of the Company became alarming. The abuses in its administration became chronic. Against its entire working there was a reaction in England —it was a moral reaction, political reaction and a business reaction. The Regu-

1. R. Muir "The Making of British India."

lating Act of 1772 became a necessity, as Sir George Lewis declared in the India Act debate of 1858, "I most confidently maintain that no civilized government ever existed on the face of this earth which was more corrupt, more perfidious and more capricious than the East India Company was from 1758 to 1784 when it was placed under Parliamentary control."[1]

With increasing corruption, became visible certain symptoms of the financial weakness of the Company. It made an appeal to the Bank of England for a loan. Lord North took the opportunity by the forelock and prepared to bring its affairs under Parliamentary control. The Regulating Act created a crude and faulty judicial and legislative machinery, and soon the history of its application proved the inadequacy of its provisions. It was the first attempt at Parliamentary control of the Company's possessions in the subcontinent, by people who were interested in exercising political patronage, and who would not trust the Company's servants. Clive is said to have declared that "The grasping character of the administration in England would lead to a ruinous interference in the nomination of persons to India who had no recommendations but their high birth and great interest." This prediction proved perfectly true when

1. Cromes "The Ancient and Modern Imperialism."

we come to the administration of Wellesley who was forced to take steps to rectify the mistakes of directors in England, in his own way.

In 1784, another Act was passed under the provisions of which the Company was brought under the "superintendence and control of British Government". It established a Board of Control which later developed into the office of the Secretary of State for India in Council. Pitt defined the object of the Act as, "to confirm and enlarge the advantages derived by the country from its connection with India" and "to render that connection a blessing to the Native Indians." This Act of 1784 though modified in subsequent years remained the governing act of the country's affairs till 1858. In 1813 when the Charter of the Company came up for renewal, the Company was deprived of its monopoly in the eastern trade. When the Charter came for renewal twenty years later a significant change occurred, and hesitatingly the association of government with direct profit-making was discontinued. The Charter was renewed for twenty years but on condition that the Company abandoned all direct work of trade and it wound up its commercial side "with all convenient speed." In 1853 the Charter was renewed in perpetuity, but the Mutiny ended the authority of the Company and by the Proclamation of 1st November, 1858, the subcontinent came

directly under the Crown. All the property of the Company was transferred to the Crown, and the Governor-General became also "the Viceroy of India." The Company relinquished its control by means of the dignified resolution of September, 1858, in which they said "Let Her Majesty appreciate the gift, let her take the vast country and the teeming millions of India under her control; but let her not forget the corporation from which she has received them, nor the lessons to be learned from its success."

It is remarkable that in spite of the anxiety of Parliament to increase its control over the authority of the Company there was hardly any interest shown by it in the control of the internal affairs of the country. There seems to have been a general belief, as that of the Duke of Wellington that "If ever we lost India, it will be parliament that will lose it for us;"[1] so the less parliament interested itself in the subject country the better the country would be governed and the more prolonged would be British authority. A preliminary idea of the way parliament "superintended and controlled" the country during this period is necessary.

In 1813 when the Charter of the Company came for renewal, Lord Grenville declared that the purpose of British Govern-

1. "I. C. S.

ment was "to declare British sovereignty, the sovereignty of the Crown being the only foundation on which we can either discharge our duties or maintain our rights—the British Crown is *De Facto* sovereign in India. How it became so is needless to enquire . This sovereignty cannot now be renounced, without still greater evils both to that country and to this, than even the acquisition of power has ever yet produced. It must be maintained....that sovereignty which we hesitate to assert, necessity compels us to exercise."[1] With these ideas parliamentary control was extended but the active interest taken in the control of the country that Parliament professed to rule is proved by the following quotation from a speech of Lord Macaulay in 1833. He declared "The House has neither the time nor the knowledge nor the inclination to attend to Indian Budget, or to the statement of Indian extravagance or to the discussion of Indian local grievances. A broken head in Coldbath Fields excites greater interest in this House than three pitched battles in India would ever excite." The Charter of 1833 was renewed in the House of Commons with "empty benches and an uninterested audience". That the matter had not improved even in the twentieth century is explained to us by Sir Edward Blunt who tells us that the subcontinent came under discussion during Budget debates only, "but

1. "I. C. S."

the budget was no budget, but merely a statement of the account of the past year and of the revised estimates of the next; and the debate was conducted by a few members who knew India and a few others who thought that they knew it."[1]

During this period of chaos nothing spectacular or profound was visible on the surface, but many subterranean changes were taking place which needed time and opportunity to come up and show their effect. The economic life of the country was beginning to crack. Even upto the end of the eighteenth century indigenous methods of production and commercial organization could stand up to any other, in any part of the world. The subcontinent was known to have the richest merchant in the world (Virji Vora at Surat) who advanced loans to European factories to be able to maintain their financial stability. A highly efficient, reliable and advanced system of commercial life prevailed in the country. But new trends were noticeable in the ninetheenth century. The use of steam power in transport and industry coming almost simultaneously revolutionized the country's life. It created effects on economic and social life which outdid the work of other agencies of Western life. Inter-communication with other countries revolutionized trade. Regular

---

"I. C. S."

communication between the subcontinent and Europe was established in 1843; and the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 accelerated the pace of advance. In 1824 cheap English cotton goods were available in the sub-continent in many remote places wherein English influence had not yet penetrated at all. The country's textiles which were articles of luxury in England at one time disappeared even in the local market, and English goods became articles of luxury. Indigenous markets lost ground and indigenous industry declined. After 1813 trade conditions had changed and the balance of trade was no longer in favour of the subject country.

Without prolonging the discussion, but in order to bring home the character of the provincial problem I shall quote a very significant passage from an official report: "The easiest way of understanding the organization of a province is to think of it as composed of districts, which in all provinces except Madras, are combined, in groups of usually from four to six, into divisions, under a commissioner. The average size of a district is 4,430 square miles or three-fourths the size of Yorkshire. Many are much bigger. Mymensingh district holds more human souls than Switzerland; Vizagapatam district both in area and population, exceeds Denmark. In the United Provinces where districts are small and the population

dense, each collector is on the average, incharge of an area as large as Norfolk, and of a population as large as that of New Zealand. The Commissioner of the Tirhut division looks after more people than the Government of Canada.

"The district, which is a collector's charge, is the unit of administration, but it is cut up into sub-divisions, under assistants or deputy collectors, and these again into revenue collecting areas of smaller size. The provincial government's general authority, thus descends through the divisional commissioner in a direct chain to the district officer. The district officer has a dual capacity, as collector he is head of the revenue organization, and as magistrate he exercises general supervision over the inferior courts and, in particular, directs the police work. Where there is no government revenue settlement, he can at any time be in touch, through his revenue subordinates, with every inch of his territory. This organization in the first place serves its peculiar purpose of collecting revenue and of keeping peace."[1]

Perhaps the most interesting and conspicuous development during the British rule had been the creation of the "Indian Army." We have already discussed the exploits and also the achievements of this

1. "Montague-Chelmsford Report."

army, but in order to understand the nature, the constitution and the development of this institution, which remained the basic institution for the expansion of British rule, we shall have to go to the ideas of its originators and the way they had diagnosed the symptoms of indigenous ailments. Dupleix, the Frenchman, who conceived of this idea did not live long enough to see the miracles achieved by his ideas when actually put into practice. It was Robert Clive, the rival of Dupleix, who was destined to put these ideas into practice and thereby be the pioneer of British rule in the subcontinent. It is in recognition of this debt to France that the Imperial Gazette of India in 1907 declared "It is indeed hardly too much to say that we owe our native army to France."

Dupleix thought in terms of evolving an idea which would be devoid of elements of individual enslavement and injustice, but would be based on the principle of ruling other people through agencies of control supplied by themselves. This basic idea was subsequently applied by the British, not only in the organization of their army, it was employed by them with real effectiveness and advantage in the civil administration too. Richard Cobden declared in 1857 that "the entire scheme of our Indian rule is based on the assumption that the natives will be willing instruments of their own humiliation". To

put it in the words of Lord Cromer "it was to be a system of administration in which native hands were to be directed by European heads". It was a policy of raising, disciplining and paying the indigenous soldiers (then known as sepoys) in the army officered by Europeans and using them for the conquest of their own countrymen. The first sepoy in the Company's forces was recruited in 1748 and gradually further recruitment was made and by 1813 the strength of the Indian Army was two hundred thousand. In 1858 the army of the Company became the army of the Crown; and thus was inaugurated a new army policy in view of the events and lessons of the Mutiny. I shall terminate this discussion by quoting the words of Sir Henry Lawrence from which the readers would judge for themselves all other aspects of the problem that naturally rise. Just before the outbreak of the Mutiny he declared, "To this day European convenience is more regarded than native wants" and again "we neither clothe nor arm our troops according to common-sense. They are not even rationally fed. The sepoy is perhaps the least paid soldier in the world, and, the large majority of them is worse fed. The European is at times too highly fed. Eating and drinking, rather than heat and cold, send him to his grave".[1]

One of the earliest and first influences of

1. "Essay Political and Military."

England was the adoption of European military organization, dress and arms by the independent and semi-independent local rulers. All local princes employed European Officers to train their soldiers and lead their armies. French political influence in active form had disappeared from the country, but through employment in the armies of the local princes they continued to exercise considerable influence in creating trouble. French influence in the armies of Tipu Sultan and the Marhattas was enormous. French Officers many a time indulged in atrocities and cruelties which would put to shame even the most modern perpetrators of sadistic methods. In the second quarter of the nineteenth century Ranjit Singh employed not only English but Italian officers also to train his Sikh soldiers. It is said he even expected (very seriously, of course) his European army officers to perform certain mechanical feats of invention for him. Having heard that there was something like a steam-boat in Europe, he set poor officers working to make one for him, to air himself on the lakes and the rivers of his domain.

We shall now turn to discuss the salient features of the nature of the administrative machinery; and the way it was devised, regulated and controlled to cope with the changing conditions. Essentially allied to the problem of administration was the problem of social relationship and intercourse between

the British community and the indigenous peoples, on which depended the health and strength of the political power. This chain of discussion necessarily leads us to the discussion of the fundamental problem, *i. e.* the way the country was looked upon by the people in charge of affairs and the method in which they approached them when they had perforce to take charge of the country and fill in the blank which was created by absolute collapse of everything indigenous.

During the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the nineteenth, it was more or less a settled policy of the Company to consider the country a closed land for all British citizens who had no direct connection with the administration of the Company which was political - cum - commercial. Parliament too fortified the Company in these notions. The Company, governed by the characteristic fears of a trading and profit-making concern would permit no penetration either of ideas or of persons. No Britisher could hold land in the subcontinent and Parliament in 1783 provided that, for going to it a licence from the Company permitting entry must be obtained. Any breach of this provision would make the person contravening it liable to fine or imprisonment and if he reached there, by hook or by crook, to deportation. Those who had settled down in the country before these regulations, had tosubmit securities for good behaviour. No

passage to the subcontinent was provided for a private citizen if he had not secured the necessary permit. The objection to promiscuous entry was that settlement would lower British prestige, which would be detrimental to authority. Even the missionaries who had necessarily to mix with the people were consequently regarded as a political and substantial danger. Women were not allowed to come to the country, because it was a battle-ground or a great big armed cantonment. The necessary consequence was complete moral deterioration in the European community. Sir John Seeley spoke the truth when he says "We came as freebooters, eager to make money quickly. We gambled with death in a horrible tropical climate. Some made their fortune and got away with it back to England. Thousands died of typhoid or malaria or through debauchery or drink".[1] Lord Cromer describes it further by writing "if we turn to the spirit which, in the first instance at all events, animated the merchant rulers of India and their agents, we cannot find much to gratify our national pride. The methods which they adopted did not differ very materially from those employed by the corrupt and rapacious officials of Ancient Rome"[2]. Lord Hastings incessantly complained and protested against the insati-

1. 'Expansion of England.'
2. "Ancient and Modern Imperialism."

able and interminable demands by the director of the Company for money. The Government of India was forced to pay the expenses of various embassies to Eastern countries and also to support the deficit possessions in the East. It is estimated that between 1793-1813 some twenty-five million pounds were sent to England to pay the Company's 'Home Debts' alone.

It was only when Parliament initiated a change in its attitude in 1813 that the local scene began to change. In that year the trade monopoly of the Company ended, and the license system was abolished. But the removal of these restrictions did not affect the situation materially. In 1833 the Company was allowed to retain political and administrative powers "in trust for His Majesty, his heirs and successors, for the service of the Government of India". But in spite of these changes matters hardly improved and there remained few opportunities and possibilities for personal contact and intercourse, except on a limited scale in the administrative headquarters, or at the military cantonments.

The British as we know had inherited lawlessness and chaos from the Mughal rule, and had actually made more profit than at any time to come. The Battle of Plassey gave them opportunity to exercise direct political authority, but they did not do so. About seven years later in 1765 the Company

secured the right to collect Diwani in certain provinces of the Mughal empire—but this right too was not actually exercised till 1772. There was no desire on the part of the British then to take charge of the administration—it was much easier to make profit in confusion. They shirked all idea of assuming any kind of responsibility. Willy nilly in 1772, the Company had no option but to "stand forth as Diwan"; and began to direct Diwani collection. When it did so, some administrative organization became an imperative necessity. The condition of lawlessness still continued and only the most unavoidable minimum requirements of administration were met with. Even in 1778 there were many districts which refused to acknowledge the authority of the Company, and would not pay revenue. Even as late as 1907 armed resistance to the government was shown in parts of Bengal and Bombay presidencies.

Thus the entire administrative machinery remained a matter of indifference and of expediency; there was nothing farsighted about it. There was no will to govern the subcontinent as a peaceful country. Of course in the hundred years after the Battle of Plassey to the Mutiny, territorial expansion was still continuing, and no one thought in terms of creating a peace-time machinery of administration. The entire British attitude was like that of an indifferent herdsman who would go with his whip and nis bowl to his cow for

milk, but if it did not give any milk, he would chastise it with a few rounds in exasperation and move on—wait till he could try again. During this period the management of the Company regarded the construction of a road, or a canal or expense on any such public work undertaking an unavoidable evil to be tackled only when there was no other alternative, and when the expense could, from the military point of view, no longer be neglected. Sir Henry Lawrence confessed in 1854 that "while our oldest Indian possessions have scarcely a road worthy of name, not a railway, not a canal and while we have done as little for them morally as physically, our philanthropists desire to annex all native states for the good of the people".

While blaming the Company—of course fairly, rightly and justifiably—we should not forget the fact that in imperialism the selfish interests always predominate the philanthropic. "An imperial power naturally expects to derive some benefits for itself from its imperialism" was the rather apologetic opinion of Lord Cromer. The administration, crude as it was, essentially interested in expansion, came across swarming disbanded soldiers of the local armies, robbers and dacoits, known as Thugs and Pindaris, and so had little time and even respite to establish peaceful authority and administrative machinery. An account of the state of the country has been vividly

left to us by Bishop Heber, the famous second Bishop of Calcutta, who had gone round in Northern India on a fact-finding mission in 1824. He writes, "the nation is still one of lawlessness and insolent habits........one ceases to wonder that bandits are from time to time heard of: and that everybody finds it desirable to take his arms with him on a journey".

It is during such a period that we are trying to discuss the administrative machinery. After the Company "stood forth as Diwan" the work of organization was undertaken in a desultory fashion. Warren Hastings was the first to interest himself in devising it. He believed that British power must behave as an indigenous power, consequently he devoted all his attention to working and maintaining the Mughal institutions as far as possible. Persian remained the court language; Muslim Law was enforced in criminal cases, and thus foundations were laid to gain the confidence of the people. Lord Cornwallis came with ideas of an opposite nature. He believed that Britain must behave as a Western power, and being himself a traditional and prosperous English gentleman, he thought modelling indigenous life, as far as possible, on English lines would be a panacea for the ills of the country; and thus he tried to create a land-owning aristocracy of the English type. He assumed the supervision of administration in general and criminal justice in particular in

1790 and created a rudimentary civil service in which the British element was conspicuous and predominant. In his efforts to make every thing as English as possible in a country which resembled England in nothing, Cornwallis spoke of indigenous Zamindars as "Lords of the soil" and "rightful owners of the land". However, degenerate and incompetent they were, he believed that "it would be necessary for the public good to grant a right of property in the soil to them"; which right to him as an English landlord, was a sacred right of property to be protected and upheld. That the idea behind the introduction of the permanent settlement was to introduce the system of English squire-archy in the subcontinent, was proved from the opinion of Sir Richard Temple who wrote that the permanent settlement was "a measure which was effected to naturalize the landed institutions of England among the natives of Bengal".

A further step of a desultory character was taken when Lord Hastings amalgamated the functions of a revenue collector and a magistrate, thus creating an office which became known as a "blending of Somerset House and the Old Bailey". The district officer thus grew up to be a miniature viceroy or a smaller Tsar. At the very start, the revenue, the magisterial and the police functions were entrusted to the same person who became to all intents and purposes a sovereign of his district. What harm had been done by creat-

ting, maintaining and every time strengthening this office is known to everyone acquainted with indigenous conditions. The office was a negation of the principle of "the separation of powers". This haphazard and crude method of administration motivated by reasons of security and expediency, continued, and no effort was made to give it a refined character. The purpose of all subsequent measures was to see that the officials had "safeguards" and the creating or institution of any public political bodies did not in any way materially affect the supreme official authority. In 1837 the British government prescribed the use of vernaculars in judicial and revenue proceedings. By giving importance to the new Courts in which vernaculars were employed for the transaction of business, the government not only did away with Persian (which was a Court language before) but gave a blow to the village Panchayat system in the country. The creating of the new judicial machinery adversely affected the system because the Panchayats didnot possess (under the new conditions) the authority to enforce the appearance of litigating parties or to enforce their decisions. But even now in the new Courts, the Muslim Law of criminal justice was enforced, and it continued to be enforced with certain modificatioms till it was finally displaced by the Indian Penal Code in 1861.

An important result of the contact of England and the country was, that the former

became conscious of new danger spots in its international relations. The very extension of British dominion in the country created new problems between England and the countries bordering on the sub-continent. The position of the country in international relations changed in this new process. She was no longer a sovereign state. Russia became a chronic headache for British diplomats and administrators and fear of Russia made them commit mistakes and blunders as grave and as costly as those of the Crimean War and the Afghan Wars. The Russian problem dominated British Imperial Policy for nearly three quarters of a century (1830-1905) and after a respite of twelve years it loomed large again. Japan was a new ally of Britain after it had defeated Russia. Tsarist Russia made England wage wars against Afghanistan and interfere in its internal affairs simply to maintain that country as a buffer state. The result of this highhandedness was that Lord Roberts could not help saying in 1880 that "it may not be flattering to our *ammour propre*, but I feel sure I am right when I say that the less the Afghans see us, the less will they hate us". It was in pursuit of the Afghan policy that many independent parts of the country were annexed to the main British possessions. Lord Auckland (1836-42), in spite of the fact that he had expressed the hope that his mission to the country was of "extending the blessings of good government and happiness to millions of her people", actually began that

period of wars for twenty years which destroyed all the beneficial aspects of the measures adopted by William Bentink; and Dr. Alexandar Duff could not resist commenting on his regime as "remarkable for its concession and compromises, for its education without religion; its ethic without God"[1]. The subcontinent which needed peace more than anything else found itself the pivot of British Imperial and Central Asian policy. It was from this time that the North-Western Frontier problem took shape. The problems and issues of those years the two independent countries carry unsolved to this day.

1. Mathew "Christianity and the Government of India."

. 4 .

CALM BEFORE THE STORM

The Proclamation of Queen Victoria in 1858 marked the end of one stage of British influence and authority, and ushered in the other. The two great institutions, the Mughal empire—and the great East India Company were brought to an end. The former came to a sad and gloomy end and the latter came to a glorious one after it had done grand service to Britain by immensely augmenting its national wealth, by adding to British national pride, by weakening and humiliating all rival European powers, and last but not least by giving a vast empire to the small island. A new institution came in the place of both and this was the British Crown. The proclamation ended the period of conquests, expansion, uncertainty and complexity; it inaugurated the period of defence, of stabilisation, of peaceful development, of constitutionalism and of profound intellectual unrest. Constitutionally, in place of the Board of Directors of the Company, was created the office of the Secretary of State in Council in London. The Governor-

General was also designated the Viceroy of India. The spirit with which it was said that the new period was being approached was expressed by Queen Victoria in her letter to the Viceroy on 2nd December 1858, which read "May the publication of her proclamation be the beginning of a new era, and may it draw a veil over the sad and bloody past".

Lord Canning who came to the country in 1856 as Governer-General left the country in 1862 as the first Viceroy of the subcontinent. It was a grand instance of British good fortune that Dalhousie the Scotsman was followed by Canning the Irishman who as a diplomat could foresee what Dalhousie in his impetuousity could not contemplate. Any Viceroy with lesser patience than that of Canning would never have begun the period which we characterise as that of peace. During the hard and trying days of the Mutiny he showed signs of consummate statesmanship, and piloted the ship of state with skill and caution as in times of storm. Thus after such a sad episode he began the period of serene and profound hopes. He believed in unflinching enforcement of authority and clemency for the dupes of other men's ambitions. The strength of British authority was fully demonstrated, and all the elements of the population settled down to think out and devise other methods of approach.

There was an often heard comment that the Viceroys were lesser men than the Governors-General of the country. It was often complained that though the office remained the highest and most coveted under the Crown, yet it had become of lesser importance than that of the Governor-General before the Mutiny. All these critics forgot the fact that the brilliance of a personality is always directly proportional to the critical nature and uncertainty of the time he lives in, and in his command of affairs. The Viceroys were people of peace (for all ostensible purposes) and peace time administrators hardly possess any brilliance. They were administrators and diplomats more than generals and conquistadors. The one Viceroy who had brilliance about him left chaos behind when he departed, a chaos from which the country could not fully recover for decades. His brilliance marred many happier aspects of development between the two countries. When he came in conflict with a general he had to go; this was because the subcontinent was essentially controlled by generals. There is no doubt that tne virtual irresponsibility of the Governor-General disappeared after the Mutiny with the institution of the office of the Secretary of State. In the provinces the Governors were no longer "Governors General at least" as Lawrences, Edwards, Elphinstone, Thomson, Mcleod, Durand and others were known. The Viceroys

could be, and were easily and promptly pulled up whenever need arose. They were not in the position of the Governors-General who accepted rebukes but did what they liked. The will of the Governors-General was more of the nature of law than that of the Viceroys and they could do many things without any consideration of the legality or illegality of their actions. The administration of the Company was committed to no broad policy of a farsighted nature so long as their profits were secure. The entire work of administration under the Crown acquired a different character.

There were factors of deeper significance which militated against the Viceroys playing the part of the Governors-General before the the Mutiny. The means of communication between England and the subcontinent became increasingly easy and quick. The Government of the country was now under the direct control of the Crown, and not of a trading company. The Viceroys represented the policy of the party in power in the British Parliament, and this was unlike the position of the Governors-General who had no definite set policy to pursue which they could not ignore if the need arose. The creation of the bureaucratic system of government made any direct exercise of personal authority by the Viceroy a less urgent need of the time. But there was one significant change. The Viceroys were the representatives of the

Crown, so their prestige stood higher. They carried a certain pomp, ostentation and halo round themselves which was denied to the Governors-General. Viceroys before the Great War were much more independent than their successors after it, because during this period the policy of the British Government was to "trust the man on the spot" whereas after it, with the visits of the Secretaries of the State, and the appointment of Statutory Commissions, the Viceroys became less independent.

For all practical purposes the subcontinent submitted to England without any irresistible opposition. It was too weak and emaciated to stand against British ascendency. It settled down to learn and to know what had given England superiority. Thus the Mutiny began the period of peaceful activity, settlement and reorganization. Every institution stood in need of change, every aspect of life stood in need of improvement. From 1858 begins the period in which the country seriously interested itself in the assimilation of the characteristic features of Western life and thought. England had exhibited its strength through the application of Western methods in civil administration and in military campaigns: the people of the country turned to the West to master the new arts of peace and war. During the next sixty years or so the whole subcontinent stood

transformed. The law of the survival of the fittest was fully realized.

In 1906 Morley declared in his budget speech in Parliament "Everyone, everyone—soldier, traveller and journalist—they all tell us that there is a new spirit in India. Be it so; how could you expect anything else? You have now been educating the people for years with Western ideas and literature. You have already given them facilities for communication with one another. How could you suppose that India could go on just as it was when there was little higher education, when the contact between one part and another was difficult and infrequent? How could you think that all that would go on as before?" The Modern subcontinent may well be said to have begun its life after the Mutiny. We witness all kinds of activity during this period. Modern industrial and commercial enterprises, modern capitalism and labour, modern political thought and social ideas, modern educational and literary adventures, modern scientific warfare and modern methods of agitation all combined to give the country a new outlook, a new shape and a new life. The population of the country showed an alarming increase in this period of peace, the activities of the state became more extensive and intensive, trade and industry developed and means of communication improved, the growth of political consciousness prepared the field for large

scale country-wide activity, and the common man of the country grew pliable to persuasion and propaganda—indeed all round there were signs not of stagnation and conservatism but of rapid and revolutionary changes. The East was no longer the unchanging East; it began to change with bewildering rapidity.

In constitutional development almost without any serious thought and reflection, the British took it for granted that if the country were to enjoy a period with a progressive and liberal system of government the best suited for it would be the one modelled on British lines. They made a serious effort to transplant British institutions on the soil of the subcontinent—nay, they tried to force British laws and institutions down the people's throats. The British had such a strong faith in the effectiveness and usefulness of their institutions that they imagined that those alone could be the panacea for universal ills. It is a character of all species to imagine their stock or class as perfect and most flawless. It is rightly said that if oxen were allowed any choice to create for themselves gods to worship, they would create an ox to be their god; because to them there could be nothing more beautiful or more perfect than an ox. The British as a result of the introduction of British institutions in the country, unwittingly created problems which proved not only baffling to the people of the country but embarrassing to them too.

It had become amply clear soon after the Mutiny that the country could not be ruled the way it was being ruled. Sir Sayid Ahmad was of the opinion that, "The evils which resulted from the non-admission of natives into the legislative council were various. The Government could never know the inadvisability of the laws and regulations which it passed. It could never hear the voice of the people on such a subject. The people had no means of protesting against what they might feel to be a foolish measure, or of giving public expression to their wishes. But the greatest mischief lay in this, that the people misunderstood the views and intentions of government. They misapprehended every act, and whatever law was passed was misconstrued by men who had no share in framing it, and hence no means of judging of its spirit.... I wish to say that the views of the government were misconstrued by the people, and that this misconstruction hurried on the rebellion". Analysing the new situation after the Mutiny he went on to write, "Now, in the first years of the British rule in India, the people were heartily in favour of it. This good feeling the government has now forfeited, and the natives verv generally say that they are treated with contempt. A native gentleman is, in the eyes of any petty official as much lower than that official as that same official esteems himself lower than a duke. The opinion of many of these officials is that no native can be a gentleman".

The British had their own fears in taking a wrong step or a hasty step in the country. They rightly judged that popular institutions were incompatible with the existence of imperialism in the subcontinent. Mr. Gladstone wrote to Sir James Graham on the 28th April, 1858, "I have had a very long conversation with Bright this evening on India.. He admits the difficulties of governing a people by a people *i.e.* India by a pure parliamentary government"[1]. But all the same something had to be done and Lord Cromer declared: "New ideas are springing up. New aspirations are being called forth. The power of public opinion is growing daily. Such a condition of affairs is one in which the task of government, and especially despotic government, is beset with difficulties of no light kind. To move fast is dangerous, but to lag behind is more dangerous still".[2]

In 1858 the British Government took over from the Company the control of the Country. In 1861 was hesitatingly realised the necessity of taking some step on the path of constitutional development. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 established certain advisory and consultative bodies for the three presidencies of Madras, Bengal and Bombay. It provided for a limited number of non-official nominated members to be selected on them.

---

1. "Cromer Ancient and Modern Imperialism".
2. H. Cotton "New India or India in Transition."

These advisory bodies were not legislatures in any sense of the term. No representatives of the people were put on them because it was supposed that they lacked the mental and moral qualities necessary to make a success of such opportunities; and the mistrust of "natives in positions of high responsibility" continued to govern the minds of British Administrators even in the first decade of the twentieth century. These Councils were merely as important as the Mughal Darbars, and only provided occasions for sparkling talk. The Act of 1861 was a crude attempt to find a way out of what Sir Bartle Frere called, the impossibility "to legislate for millions of people with few means of knowing except by a rebellion whether the laws suit them or not". The underlined idea of benevolent despotism was not abandoned. Even the liberals and utilitarians in England did not think it worth while to try experiments on representative institutions in right earnest. The prevalent belief was that authoritarian institutions were better suited to the life and character of the country.

If the Hindu-Muslim antagonism was latent, amorphous or nebulous before the Mutiny, it crystallized and took shape after it. By the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century it threatened to develop into a problem for the country as a whole—more so to be the problem of the subcontinent. Because of this phenomenon, which the British adminis-

trators marked and recognised very well, it was believed that a strong neutral government was a necessity, and the British administration should try to maintain a balance of power between the indigenous communities. It was fully recognised that open display of favour to any community would prove dangerous for the smooth governance of the subcontinent. What this policy achieved was alluded to by Sir John Seeley. "India is of all countries that which is least capable of evolving out of itself a stable government. And it is to be feared that the British rule may have diminished, whatever little power of this sort India may have originally possessed"[1]

During this period it was believed that the attainment of self-governing institutions by the country was a work of generations. It was these notions of long continuation of British authority—which was expected to surpass all previous empires—and of "holding India for England" which prompted the imperial statesmen of Britain like Disraeli and Lytton to think of assuming the Mughal imperial titles for Queen Victoria in 1876. Some half hearted measures were adopted in 1873 and 1893 and local self-government institutions were introduced in rural and urban areas, the purpose of which was said to be "not primarily with a view to improvement in administration that the measure is put

1. 'Expansion of England'.

forward and supported. It is chiefly desirable as a measure of political and popular education". This resolution of the18th May,1882 was significant in the constitutional history of the subcontinent. The institutions thus created were modelled on British local self-government institutions with all kinds of reservations and modifications to suit the local conditions and the administrative policies. The official report on the country in 1921 said: "It is only just to remark that the disappointing history of local self-government during the last twenty-five years is not altogether to be explained by the apathy of those among whom it has been somewhat artificially implanted. It is no doubt true that centuries prior to the foundation of British-rule, indigenous institutions, framed for needs not dissimilar from those of modern local self-government both existed and worked in some parts of India. But during the anarchy of the eighteenth century, they were in a large measure destroyed by the prevalence of military despotism; and in the period of re-creation, for which the nineteenth century stood, their submerged foundations were not utilized to the best possible advantage by the British administration. Hence, the institutions of local self-government in their present form are a creation of British rule, and to a considerable degree alien from the spirit of the people. While they have struck their roots more deeply year by year, it is unfair to expect very rapid progress." This

was the disappointing comment on the nature and working of the local self-government institutions in the country in 1921, and that in spite of the fact that Lord Morley wrote to the Governor-General: "I desired Your Excellency in Council to consider the best way of carrying out a policy that would make the village a starting point in public life."

The next Councils Act, also known as the Lord Cross Act, was passed in 1892. The number of the members of the Councils was increased and provision was made for the nomination of a few persons on the recommendation of the Local bodies, universities and Chambers of Commerce. But even then the principle of election in any shape or form was not recognised. Permission to put the questions to the executive was granted to the Councils, but they were not authorised to exceed the limit and indulge in supplementaries. The budget could be discussed by them in general terms but no reduction could be moved. The councils thus worked as little more than mere consultative committees, mutely collaborating with the executive authority. The amusing manner in which the Councils and their members behaved made the politicians who were agitating for further reforms stigmatise the Councils as "gilded shams" and their members as "magnificent nonentities."

In 1909 Lord Morley declared in Parliament that "a wave of political unrest was indeed slowly sweeping over India. Revolutionary voices, some moderate, others extreme grew articulate and shrill, and claims or aspirations for extending the share of the people in their own government took more organised shape." By this time national extremism had become conspicuous by its widespread activity; but even at that stage a self-governing country was a distant proposition. The Reform Act of 1909 was passed by Parliament, which provided for increase in the numerical strength of the Councils and for the abolition of officialm ajorities in provincial legislatures. The right of interpellation was extended and the members could move resolutions on the budget. The most far-reaching and significant decision of these Minto-Morley reforms was the introduction of communal representation with a separate electorate for the Muslims. A national of the country was appointed to the Viceroy's executive council. This post, to which Lord Sinha was appointed, was supposed to be a great innovation and a grand and liberal concession. It was disliked by the bureaucracy because it was a profane idea to provide opportunity to a native to take part in the confidential council of administration. Lord Lansdowne complained in the House of Lords that a "foreign" element was being introduced in the country.

Lord Morley, "The most autocratic and the least constitutional secretary of State ever seen in Whitehall" emphatically denied that the Minto-Morley reforms were an attempt to introduce parliamentary institutions in the country. He declared, "But in the Imperial Council we consider an official majority essential. It may be said that this is a most flagrant logical inconsistency. So it would be on one condition. If I were attempting to set up a parliamentary system in India, or if it could be said that this chapter of reforms led directly or indirectly up to the establishment of a parliamentary system in India, I, for one would have nothing at all to do with it. I do not believe—it is not of very great consequence what I believe, because the fulfilment of my vaticinations could not come off very soon—in spite of the attempt in oriental countries at this moment, interesting attempts to which we all wish well, to set up some form of parliamentary system—it is no ambition of mine, at all events, to have any share in beginning that operation in India. If my existence, either officially or corporally, were prolonged twenty times longer than either of them is likely to be, a parliamentary system in India is not at all the goal to which I would for one moment aspire."

There was no intention on the part of the government to take the next step, but it seemed that the Great War precipitated matters and at once brought all constitu-

tional, social, economic and military problems to the forefront. The strain of the war effort on the people of the country and the hopes created in their minds of political reforms in view of their war sacrifices created a condition of ferment and uneasiness which made a fresh move by the government imperative. Mr. Asquith declared that, "henceforth Indian questions would have to be approached from a different angle of vision." The Montagu-Chelmsford reform of 1919 was the result of this "different angle of vision." When they began to work, the country at once started on the path of parliamentary life modelled on British lines. Here was a scheme introduced (the introduction of which was categorically denied by Lord Morley, in 1909, as being the object of his reforms) now seriously pursued to natural conclusions. Lord Morley did not realize that the local self-government institutions introduced in 1882 had made the introduction of a parliamentary system, at some stage, inevitable. The policy of the British government with regard to the subcontinent was defined as directed to achieving "increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire;" but simultaneously this policy was qualified by certain other considerations. The Secretary of State

unequivocally declared that "I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India, on which the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility."

The system of government introduced by the Act was known as "Dyarchy." At the centre there were practically no concessions made; but in the provinces certain subjects like Education, Public Health, Local self-government etc., were declared 'Transferred' subjects in charge of elected representatives in the provincial legislatures. An important ratio of the official and the nominated members in the provincial and the central legislature, was maintained. The Act gave power to the Viceroy to certify (as a power of veto) any measure he thought necessary under the vague pretext of: "The safety, tranquility and interests of British India." Communal representation as initiated by the Minto-Morley reforms was continued with very far-reaching repercussions on the future of the country.

Here was a step taken from which there was no going back. The Act satisfied some and disappointed many. The entire scheme was characterised by Mrs. Besant as one "unworthy of England to offer, and of India to accept." The Indian National Congress (which had emerged typically Hindu) declared it "inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing." Sir Surendera Nath Banerjee wrote "The success of a diarchy seems to me to depend largely upon the atmosphere created in the secretariat in which it has to work. It depends upon the goodwill and the hearty co-operation of the Governor, the members of the Executive Council in charge of the reserved side, and of the permanent officials of the various departments."[1] Lord Birkenhead in his speech on the 7th of July, 1925 described it as "the kind of pedantic hide-bound constitution to which Anglo-Saxon communities had not generally responded, and....unlikely to make a successful appeal to a community whose political ideas were....so largely derived from Anglo-Saxon models." Sir H. Butler informs us that Dyarchy began to be used as a term of abuse or as the name of a new tennis racket. Thus from the very beginning doubts were expressed about its success. But whatever the subsequent developments one fact was unequivocally proved, that it was difficult to govern the country, without the help and co-opera-

1. "A Nation in the Making."

tion of its peoples ; and this actually meant the beginning of the loss of British political power.

The entire character of the constitutional development after the Mutiny was governed by the ideals of the party in power in the British Parliament. The subcontinent was a sole responsibility of the Government--but in any policy pursued all parties were unanimous. In spite of this unanimity various constitutional measures displayed characteristic marks of particular political ideologies. General Creach described the attitude of Parliament and the nature of its control over the country thus in 1919, "This situation has arisen from the fact that the legislature neither understands India's requirements nor has ever sufficiently considered before hand the Acts it passed, and puts into force in that country. Nor has it even taken steps to see that its own acts are adhered to in both the letter and the spirit. The neglect of the legislature both to the secrecy maintained regarding all rules and regulations made by the Governor-General of India for conduct of executive business and by ignorance prevailing in England regarding the great dependency."[1]

Describing the constitutional structure of the country Sir John Simon said that, "The

1. "Indian Studies."

present constitutional structure of India is a very complicated structure indeed—a building of many parts and varied materials, in which you may trace the influence of earlier systems of architecture; some portions expressing what is traditional of the East, as well as portions which have been boldly borrowed in recent years from the West." In 1833 Lord Macaulay had declared that the day when India would be mature for self-government, "will be the proudest day in English History"; but all this time there was no one in England who could ever imagine that the march of events in the country would be so rapid, that the process of maturity was going to be so accelerated by world changes and world conditions and that: "The proudest day in English History" would arrive before British administration would have the imagination to recognise it. The phrase "benevolent despotism" so foreign to the British people was employed to maintain hold on the subcontinent, little realizing that all kinds of imperialism and despotism had become obsolete and out-of-date after the War. It was paradoxical for democratic England to play the role of a benevolent despot—and she played it with very clumsy success. When the Act of 1919 came into operation the futility of transplanting British Parliamentary institution into the subcontinent became manifest; but it was at the same time very surprising that the people of the country true to the maximum "the remedy for the

ills of democracy is still more democracy" having got a taste for a parliamentary system —in a way liked it and wanted to stick to it— agitated more and more for thorough-going parliamentary institutions even when those already existing had created so many complications and unsurmountable problems for the country.

A typical post-Mutiny development was the bureaucratic machinery of government. The purely personal rule of about sixty years before the Mutiny was followed by the unadulterated bureaucratic administration of the post-Mutiny years. There was a Civil Service before the Mutiny too but the character, importance and significance of it changed when the country came directly under the authority of the Crown. The servants of the Company had generally enough capacity to adapt themselves to the local conditions and life; but the new servants of the Crown had less of an indigenous outlook about them. A correspondent of the Times at this time observed that it was a "curious fact that all Indian reports were far better done under Company rule....I believe the true reason is that the servants of the Company had to justify their work and the obligation does not appear to be in the same degree upon servants of the Crown.....the present craze of official secrecy was also then unknown."

Easy intercourse between England and

the subcontinent after the opening of the Suez, leave allowances with pay granted to European members of the services, made them indifferent to local conditions. Little did they realize that without interest there can be no knowledge, and that without knowledge there can be no government. Many of them gathered themselves under "the ruling race" idea and this gave offence to the growing generation of the country. The English educated youth saw the inconsistencies and contradictions between what prevailed in England and what was practised in the subcontinent. Certain fundamental principles of administration like the separation of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial powers, the representative control of taxation, trial by jury, the freedom of discussion and the criticism of administrative measures in public and in the Press, the recognition of constitutional opposition and so on, were conspicuous by their absence; and instead prevailed, unfeeling and mechanical bureaucratic control in which more and more stress was laid on rules and regulations and less on the state of the minds of the people, on and against whom all sorts of measures were enforced. The result of the bureaucratic system was that: "The Indian people are quite ignorant of the benefits they enjoy under British rule, yet they are expected to be grateful for them."[1]

---

1. O'Moore Creach "Indian Studies."

The bureaucracy had a monopolistic control of administration, and it was on them that the success or failure of all parliamentary measures depended. Many a time prior to the making of laws the views of the bureaucracy were ascertained. His Majesty's government was always afraid lest their measures should go unenforced or mutilated. The bureaucracy was governed by certain unwritten and conventional rules of service and they remained united as a trade union. It was a visible sign of the time that since the transfer of the control of the country to the Crown there had been decided, and in some cases progressive deterioration in the influence exerted by Parliament over administration in the subcontinent. The bureaucracy would not countenance any measures to be introduced in the country, even of a social and ameliorative nature, which would even remotely affect their false sense of prestige. Lord Lawrence getting alarmed at this hostility to indigenous people's welfare wrote : "The difficulty in the way of the Government of India acting fairly in these matters is immense. If any thing is done or attempted to be done, to help the natives, a general howl is raised which reverberates in England and finds sympathy and support there. I feel quite bewildered what to do. Everyone is, in abstract, for justice, moderation and such like excellent qualities but when one comes to apply such like principles so

as to affect anybody's interests, then a change comes over them."

It was in this mood that the bureaucracy worked in the country. Its special features were its inaccessibility to interviewers, frequent changes in appointment, excessive regard for promotion by seniority and above all what is known as its 'red-tapism' in the disposal of public business. The Indian Civil Service was the most extravagant and expensive service of its kind in the world. In its nature, powers and privileges it stood unique. A civil servant was a curious mixture of a minister of the Crown, the chief permanent official and a maid of all work. Extravagance and strict secrecy became a universal complaint against its activities; its sensitiveness against public criticism became proverbial. The opinion of Ramsay MacDonald was that "the Indian Civil Service has sought to widen the scope of sedition until it should include everything not flattery." Unscrupulousness was its notorious trait. A civil servant was said to possess no moral convictions and he had no compunctions. He generally left his humanity in England and if he brought it to the subcontinent (a big and unpardonable mistake if he did) he was forced to put it in the drawer of his table. On retirement he refitted his rusted sensibilities back in his nature, but with all polish they rarely shone again. There were

no few occasions which could be cited when efforts were made either to purchase public opinion or to suppress it ruthlessly. The sun-dried bureaucrat was a lineal descendant of the Mughal officialdom differing from his predecessors in possessing cleverer and more modern methods and instruments of application. A district magistrate was a miniature Governor-General, a smaller Tsar, a camouflaged Leviathan of Hobbes. It was a settled notion with him that politics and administration were antithetical and ir-r econcilable. He was more interested in the prestige of the rule and in his own personal authority than in the welfare of the people left in his charge.

The bureaucracy has been variously criticised as a failure and praised as a success. It may have succeeded in spheres where a bureaucratic procedure was needed, but it miserably failed where national aspiration were concerned. Mr. Gokhale attacked it "for its utter contempt of public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior widsom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people, the mockery of an appeal to its sense of justice, its cool preference to service interests to those of the governed." Lloyd George described it as "the steel frame of the entire structure of administration." The people of other countries looked upon it is as "a miracle of the British gift for Government." By 1917 it

was clear that this illogical framework of British rule could never continue unaltered and unreformed. Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of State was forced to recognise the need of change in the bureaucratic machinery and stigmatised it as "too wooden, too iron and too inelastic."

A brief survey of the historical development of the Civil Service will not be out of place. A nucleus of this service existed in the time of Warren Hastings, but the so called "covenanted civil service of India" was introduced in 1793. Lord Cornwallis in pursuit of his policy of seeing the British power in the country a Western power, put all covenanted services in charge of Europeans and the sons of the soil were permitted to hold "uncovenanted services" in the administration. There were some Europeans still occupying the higher uncovenanted posts but due to financial reasons Lord Amherst in order to effect economy in the administration put uncovenanted services in charge of natives who were much cheaper to hire. Describing the nature of the uncovenanted service the Hon. Emily Eden (sister of Lord Auckland, the Governor-General) says: "The uncovenanted service is just one of our choicest Indianisms, accompanied with our very worse Indian feelings. We say the words just as you talk of the poor chimney sweepers or those wretched scavengers—the uncovenanted being, in

fact, clerks in the public offices." The act of 1833 opened the civil service to the natives of the soil, but nothing was actually done by way of implementing its provisions. In 1855 the competitive examination system was introduced; but as the examinations were held in England few nationals of the subcontinent took advantage of the system. Again a Civil Service Act was passed in 1861 which revised the conditions of service to admit native talents but actually little was achieved. Other clumsy steps were taken in 1870, 1880 and 1891, but even then very few non-English got into the service. The result of the efforts of people like Dadabhai Naoroji was that till 1915 there were only 63 non-English (5% of the total strength) admitted to the covenanted service which was designated; "The statutory civil service" in 1879. As late as 1935 the strength of the non-English had just risen to 30 per cent.

A commission on the Indian Civil Service was appointed in 1886 under the Chairmanship of Sir Charles Aitchison "to devise a scheme .... to do full justice to the claims of natives of India to higher employment in the public services." In view of the recommendations of this commission all government services were classified into the Imperial, the Provincial and the Subordinate Services. The number of indigenous employees in the Subordinate services was greatest; in the Provincial services their

number was moderate and in the Imperial services it was negligible. The argument against giving an increasing share to sons of the subcontinent in the administration was that, as Lord Curzon puts it, "the question at issue is rather not what is the maximum number of offices that can safely be given to Indians but what is the minimum that must of necessity be reserved for Europeans." Thus the policy of "Indianization" was followed by fits and starts, and generally the principle was recognised but nothing was actually done. A further Commission known as the Lord Islington Commission was appointed in 1912, which was followed in 1924 by the Lee Commission which recommended that certain higher posts in the transferred departments of government be staffed by local recruitment, and they further recommended a certain principle of selection by following which the number of natives employed and British civil servants would be equal in 1939.

Thus on the problem of services the attitude of the government and the ideas of the people stood poles apart. The spread of education made concessions the imperative need of the time and the people of the subcontinent could not be easily set aside on the pretext of their moral or mental incompetence. The people began to make increasing and incessant demands for a share in the administration of their country, and even political agitation centred on this issue. Sir

Surendranath Banerjee explained that "the efforts of the last few years had stirred a strange and hitherto unfelt awakening among our people and had created new hopes and new aspirations. It was not enough that we should have our full share of the higher offices; but we aspired to have a voice in the councils of the nation. There was the bureaucracy. For good or evil, it was there. We not only wanted to be members of the bureaucracy and to leave it with the Indian element, but we looked forward to controlling it, and sharing and guiding its measures, and eventually bringing the entire administration under complete popular domination." It was becoming increasingly clear that the subcontinent alone among the civilized nations of the world had a government that was free from internal popular control: and that all decisions lay in the hands of an administration which had little sympathy with the people of the country. All pseudo-legislative institutions were advisory bodies without even the semblance of power. There was general criticism of the government that in the twentieth century of advancement and progress, of democracy and freedom, it did not care to grapple with the problems of the illiterate masses, of the starving millions and of the sickly ryot. It was the un-English character of government which was described by Sir John Seeley as one "which is bureaucratic—which rests on military force, which raises its revenue not in European fash-

ion but taking the place of a universal landlord, and in a hundred other ways departs from the traditions of England," so that the people wanted to change it. There were inherent difficulties for a bureaucratic government to tackle popular and national problems. Thus, in years after the war it was the system of government which became the target of attack.

With the increasing association of nationals of the country in the administration a great change was noticeable in the indigenous society. Official position was not only coveted thing but it became the biggest bone a of contention among the communities and the classes of the country. There were equal opportunities open for all to grab what they could, and as quickly as they could. The official position carried certain attraction and a halo of superiority which no other profession could provide. This vast and most expensive bureaucracy in the world was superimposed upon an economy which was relatively very poor and miserable; and thus the official position carried a certain super-aristocratic significance. English education by hook or by crook, was the only means of reaching the available highest offices. Once finding themselves in possession of official position the English Educated classes became part of the ruling classes and they enjoyed many privileges denied to the common people. Thus association in the adminis-

tration became not only a matter of loaves and fish but of prestige and superiority. "Fight for services" was an additional feature of the country's life. But soon a reaction ensued. All the ruling class opportunities began to disappear. Thousands of highly educated youngmen could not be adequately provided with jobs. Education became a burden for the youth. Youngmen devoted their time and attention to other matters which would satisfy their innate urge of adventure in their life of frustration. Agitation and anarchism took root in the country's life. Economic strangulation gave rise to political revolt. This entire process was logically explained by the Simon Commission. They said that the youngmen "are not profiting either intellectually or materially by their university training; many fall by the way having wasted previous years of youth, many succeed in obtaining the coveted B.A. Degree, only to find that the careers for which alone it fits them are hopelessly congested. Many of these half-educated and wholly disillusioned youths consequently remain unemployed, with results upon the political and social life of the country too obvious to call for emphasis."

All the administrative and nationalist activities of the nineteenth century found their culmination in the regime of Lord Curzon. In 1899 he came to the country as Viceroy, to dominate the political scene. Lord Curzon

was one of the most interesting, intelligent, versatile and spectacular Viceroys the sub-continent had seen; it was soon proved that he also became one of the most brilliant British statesmen of the time. World history records few outstanding peace-time administrators, and Lord Curzon was one of those. He came in charge of a comparatively peaceful country and left it agitated and in commotion. It can safely be asserted that he marked the end of one phase of the Indo-British relationship and the beginning of another. With him began that which is generally known in literature as "India in Transition". During his regime the nineteenth century sub-continent began to fade away and the twentieth century one took shape. He himself was a queer mixture of the nineteenth and the twentieth century ideas. He had been some time (with a great deal of justification and truth) called the Aurangzeb of British rule in the sub-continent. He was a perfect autocrat and he never disguised the fact. When he came as Viceroy of the subcontinent, he shook the entire sub-continent and its administration to their very foundations. His masterly and imperious hands left nothing untouched and nothing escaped his typical Curzonian strokes.

As soon as he set his foot in the country he declared that he would tackle all the problems "all of them waiting to be taken up, all of the questions which ought to have been taken up long ago, and to which as soon as I have the

time, I propose to devote myself". He was as true as his words. There was no problem of the country on which he had nothing definite to say. Restless in temper and outspoken in his views—a veritable patriarch of mankind—he always contemplated changes and innovations. Having once taken a decision he was stubborn—more so in opposition—in execution, regardless of consequences. It is said that he generally took decisions himself and consulted the people concerned later with the purpose of getting their consent registered to them. Going through the records of his administration and through his writings and speeches, one sometimes wonders whether Lord Curzon actually realised the effects that his words would produce and knew the consequences of his measures. Mere flow of language and romantic ebullition in writing and speech hardly gave reality to his measures. He was like a physician who diagnosed well but invariably prescribed not only a wrong medicine but a wrong dose. No doubt he was a great man, a learned man and a genius, but alas only fifty years late in time.

On the 28th October, 1898 he declared at a gathering in London, "I love India, its people, its history, its government, the absorbing mysteries of its civilization and its life". Lord Morley said about him, "you never will send to India a Viceroy his superior, if indeed, his equal in force of mind, in passionate and devoted interest in all that concerns

the well being of India, with an imagination fired by the grandeur of the political problem that India presented. You never sent a man with more of all these attributes than when you sent Lord Curzon"[1]. And the tribute of Mr. Gokhale at the Benares Congress in 1907 was that: "Thus the man who professed in all sincerity before he assumed the reins of office, his great anxiety to show the utmost deference to the feelings and even the prejudices of those over whom he was set to rule, ended by denouncing in unmeasured terms not only the present generation of Indians but also their remote ancestors, and the ideals of their race which they cherish above everything else".

Lord Curzon believed that the country needed an efficient government and not self-government. He believed that efficient government could only be of the British variety and no other. He openly declared "efficiency has been our gospel, the keynote of our administration". He believed that the benevolent despotism of British rule was in the best interests of the country. He openly declared that British Government in the country was necessarily a despotism tempered only by the character of men who administered it, and by their accountability to the British Government. He believed that the subcontinent was a possession of England and it should be held in a strong imperial grip. He believed that no spread of political thought

1. V. Lovett "A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement".

and activity should be allowed in the country. In his enthusiasm for efficiency and imperial ideas he either overlooked or underestimated the trend of the forces so very active in the country. He did not realise—and refused to countenance the fact—that developments were taking place in the country in a direction and with a rapidity which made any prolonged working of autocracy, in any shape or form, impossible. Speaking about the national movement in 1900 he declared in exultant jubilation that: "My own belief is that the Congress is tottering to its fall, and one of my great ambitions, while in India, is to assist it to a peaceful demise". It is strange that when he came to the country he declared that the qualifications of a Viceroy were "courage and sympathy" whereas when he retired one could not help arriving at the conclusion, that he had indeed too much of the former in him but hardly any of the latter quality.

In the subcontinent Curzonianism and Machiavellianism became synonymous words. It was many a time proved that he never realised that what was morally wrong could not be politically right. His conceptions of efficiency forced him *ipso facto* to convert the country into a police state. He forgot that the word efficiency necessarily meant force. He did not realise that efficiency like that noble word "liberty" meant a multitude of sins and evils. He never realized that "will

not force was the basis of the state"; and that when force alone becomes the basis of the state its doom is inevitable. The tyranny of the police became a universal cry in the country and Col. Osborn wrote in 1935 that: "The very efficiency of the English government in India makes the police tyranny all the more unbearable, for in any loosely governed country an insurrection would wipe out the offending police," and that: "The half-clad natives of Lahore submit to English made police restrictions that would drive a suburb of London into revolt"[1].

The Police Commission, appointed in the regime of Lord Curzon, in its report declared: "There can be no doubt that the police force throughout the country is in most unsatisfactory condition, that abuses are common everywhere, that this involves great injury to the people and discredit to the government; and that radical reforms are urgently necessary. These reforms will cost much because......the department has been starved ....The police force is far from efficient; it is defective in training and organisation, it is inadequately supervised; it is generally regarded as corrupt and oppressive and it has utterly failed to secure the confidence and cordial cooperation of the people". General Sir O'Moore Creach went further and wrote: "It is however, no excuse, that because the state of the police was worse under

1. "Must England lose India."

native rulers, gross abuses which undoubtedly exist should be tolerated under British rule. The police in India come from the people, and their morality is no better and no worse than that of the classes of people from whom they are enlisted........Why then should castes renowned for lack of civic virtues be enlisted in the police?—yet this is commonly done"[1]. One really wondered whether the British government in the sub-continent at all felt responsible for the primary functions of a state.

Lord Curzon's term of office forced the educated people of the country to think politically and to see their country in relation to the rest of the world. Curzon indirectly became the political tutor of the sub-continent. His opinions, whether favourable or unfavourable, were valued because they explained true facts and taught lessons. To the students of Edinburgh University he said in 1909, "Consider in the first place what a part India had played in the shaping of the British policy and the expansion of British dominion. It has been the determining influence in every considerable movement of British power to the East and the South of Mediterranean......But for India Lord Beaconsfield would not have bought the shares in Suez Canal, and but for the Suez Canal we should have not been in Egypt. The historic rivalry and struggles with Russia for nearly a cen-

1. "Indian Studies."

tury sprang from the frontiers of India. Had it not been for India we should never have seized the Cape nor begun that career of South African expansion that has lately entered upon so remarkable and pregnant a phase". Speaking about departmental working in the administration, he declared, "Dapartmentalism is not a moral delinquency. It is an intellectual hiatus —the complete absence of thought or apprehension of anything outside the purely departmental aspect of the matter under discussion".

Lord Curzon by a breathless succession of not a few controversial measures blew the wind, and the whirlwind was faced by his embarrassed successor. When he left the country there was universal sigh of relief. He left a permanent mark on the geography of India by creating a new province—the North West Frontier—in 1901. On the 30th of March 1904 he defined Frontier policy as "Withdrawal of British forces from advanced positions, employment of tribal forces in defence of tribal country, concentration of British forces in British territory behind them as a safeguard and a support, and improvement of communications in the rear." Addressing a tribal assembly he boldly warned the tribal chiefs "You are the keepers of your own house....but if you dart out from behind the shelter of the door to harass and pillage and slay, then you must not be surprised if we return quickly and batter the door in." His ideas of imperial

splendour and pomp in relation with the princely states were characteristically medieval. His Coronation Darbar of 1903 was described as "a pompous pageantry to a perishing people"—it was an occasion which was said to have rivalled, if not surpassed, any such occasion celebrated by any medieval potentate. He got the Victoria Memorial erected at Calcutta—the only really beautiful piece of architecture put up during the British rule. He introduced reforms in education which left it still more in need of reform. His educational measures brought forth the criticism that they were meant to officialize education. "Lord Curzon did more than any other ruler of India, since Bentinck's time to stamp the educational policy with his own characteristics. What he believed, was taught in schools and colleges for the first fifteen years of this century." His views on the army administration brought him in conflict with Lord Kitchener and that led to his resignation. The partition of Bengal was a result of his over-efficiency, thoroughness and brilliance, and it had to be reversed in 1911. His hand invisibly moved in every branch of the administration. Directly or indirectly Lord Curzon became the only single factor (if one could be pointed out) responsible for the resurgent sub-continent of the twentieth century.

An important phase of the post-Mutiny period was the new character of the princely

states. A new terminology was invented to suit their status and enrich political vocabulary. A novel political status was assigned to them unknown to political science before. Soon after the Mutiny, Lord Canning declared "There is a reality in the suzerainty of the sovereign of England which has never existed before and which is not only felt but eagerly acknowledged by the chiefs." Lord Lytton emphasised in 1877 that he had inaugurated a "new policy by virtue of which the Crown of England should henceforth be identified with the hopes, the aspirations, the sympathies and interests of a powerful native aristocracy", and one could hear Maharaja Scindia voicing the tender sentiments of his brother princes by saying "Shah-in-Shah Padisha, may God bless you! The princes of India bless you, and pray that your sovereignty and power may remain steadfast for ever".

So began to develop the princely states—one third of the sub-continent geographically, one-fourth of it in population—governed by the remnants of the medieval princely order. The Indian states were a medley of anomalies and incongruities, cultural, geographical, economic, political and social. It was well said that "they are not what they seem and what they are is beyond description." They did not form a part of the Empire, nor had they any sovereign political authority or status. They were neither feudatories, nor protectorates, nor mere allies and

to explain their status, a new word "Paramountcy" was employed. It meant that the British Government as a paramount power had the right to interfere in the affairs of the States, in any way it saw fit and in any matter however insignificant which might include carrying out of certain general internal reforms; enforcement of certain instructions from the paramount power, securing redress of certain wrongs to individuals, sending away certain court favourites and hangers-on, stopping all extravagance: physical, moral and financial; effecting changes in ministers, and even forcing the princes to go on voluntary exile on short notice—not necessarily written. In the princely states was noticed every stage of social and political development and among the princes was marked every stage of human development except the latest, the most decent and sensible.

The administration of the Company regarded the local princes as allies that "wanted watching". It was then a relationship of "watchful distrust". After the Mutiny, as a reward of their loyalty the British government definitely and emphatically laid it down as a principle of state policy that annexation as a solution of the problem of mis-government, maladministration or disloyalty should not be resorted to. Soon after the Mutiny the princes were disarmed and in the new status they lost all individuality, but gained security. They lost all powers to play mis-

chief in political life but simultaneously they became invulnerable so long as they danced to a certain imperial tune. The crown threw to the winds all their old notions of power and importance and they stood propped up by the paramount power. In this state of helplessness the people could attack them with greater effectiveness and ease. These shivering pigeons stood in constant awe of the hawk in the form of the paramount power and the gun-man in the form of the people's political consciousness. All lessons of life and history had the same effect on the princes as water on a duck's back. Lord Mayo's civilizing efforts were of no benefit to them. They stood insensible to all the rational and decent ways of life; it was getting increasingly clear that their days were numbered. They enjoyed power without responsibility and security without struggle. An observer of the country's conditions commented that "the Indian state system is governed by the natural law governing growth of organism. They enjoy certain tranquillity and peaceful protection, and they do not stand in need of struggle to live, the result is that they atrophy, degenerate and so become parasitic". Indeed the paramount power made the princes safe against themselves, but never against the forces which were beyond the control of all.

The nature and composition of the army changed after the Mutiny. All the previous

notions were revised and a new army policy was formulated. All the old classes and communities from which recruitment for the armed forces was made were set aside because they were supposed to have lost all fighting qualities. Recruitment was thus effected from quite different geographical parts of the country and from quite different sections of the population. All the Company's forces were liquidated and merged in the Crown forces. A new theory of "Martial" and "Non-Martial" races was introduced to govern the army policy. The states had been loyal on the whole and their forces were a great help in quelling the Mutiny; and so a new policy was evolved to regulate relations with the state forces and during the regime of Lord Dufferin they were designated as "Imperial Forces". The state forces were supposed to be allied forces always ready for use in time of need by the paramount power, moderately trained but adequately disarmed and in no way forming a part of the British Army.

Long before the Mutiny, Sir Henry Lawrence had advised "to put it beyond the power of any section of the military community to beard the government; perhaps destroy it"[1]. And General Creach informs us that, "After the Mutiny the most distinguished soldiers and administrators with large Indian experience decided on the

1. "Essays Political and Military."

relative strength at which both should be maintained in the future, so as to render impossible a recurrence of such events. They were of the opinion that the artillery of the army should always be British; that the country should be disarmed, feudatory states included; that the import of the modern arms should be prohibited except under licences. Licences were, and are freely given to all respectable Indians for rifles for sporting purposes but not for military firearms.[1]" Sir William Hunter while describing the new army wrote, "Broadly speaking the number of British troops was doubled while that of the native troops was reduced to one-half. The native army was remodelled both as to its material and organisation. The Sikhs, the Gurkhas, and the Pathans have largely supplanted the pampered sepoy of the middle valley of the Ganges and Oudh. The native army, thus recruited from hardier materials is also better organised. Not only has the fighting value of each battalion been greatly increased, but is so composed as to render combination of its units against authority much more difficult." And Col. Osburn acknowledged the fact that the "composite Indian army has been recruited and organised in such a way that it is absolutely dependent on English control for its cohesion, even for its very existence."

1. "Indian Studies."

It was concluded that the Marhattas, the Rohillas, the Tamils and other communities of Southern and Central parts of the country no longer possessed any fighting qualities and had lost all martial spirit. They were supposed to be exhausted communities, who had done much fighting in the regime of the Company and they needed rest. They were supposed to be more disposed towards settling down to peaceful professions of life; and their activities during the Mutiny had proved their military inefficiency. In place of these sepoys came the Gurkhas, the Dogras, the Rajputs, the Sikhs, the Jats, the Pathans, the Baloch and so on—the people from the predominantly Muslim areas of the North-West Frontier, the Punjab and the Western United Provinces.

The Muslims now constituted a predominant element of the armed forces of the country. They slowly reconciled themselves to the British rule, and began to take interest in the military life again. It was now in the interest of Britain to turn to the people who had been doing the fighting through a good many centuries of the past. Political exigencies demanded close collaboration with the disaffected Muslims, and it was established. Islam was the only religion in the world in which the passion of the soldier had a religious touch about it. The British had only to prove to the Muslims that by joining the

British armed forces they were not only not helping an infidel, but actually helping, directly or indirectly a religious cause. Britain gave an impression to the Muslims that it supported the Sultan of Turkey against Russia, and that it had subdued the Sikhs who were great enemies of Islam. Muslim theologians indulged in subtle discussions whether the country was a "*Dar-ul-Harb*" or a "*Dar-ul-Islam*." These so-called Muslim divines declared that British rule was an exception to the general ideas of a foreign rule, and that it was illegal to oppose the government. *Fatwas* from these Muslim mercenaries were not hard or expensive to obtain—and they were obtained.

Long before the Mutiny, Sir Henry Lawrence had advised, by repeating the words of Wellington and Cromwell; "Trust in God", 'Keep your treaties' and 'Keep your powder dry." The army was maintained in a state of preparedness because it was believed that "insurrections cannot be postponed, like tea-parties, with a note, nor enemies be bound over to keep peace until it is quite convenient to you to fight." The normal duties of the army were described by General Creach as, (*a*) to assist civil power in maintaining peace and order (*b*) to maintain peace on the land frontier by resisting any rising of tribes (*c*) to meet eventualitics in Afghanistan, (*d*) to maintain order on the Persian Gulf littoral, (*e*) to withstand

any advance in the country should war break out with any great power, and (*f*) to use it in overseas operations great or small.

The civil administration always regulated all its policies in relation with the army policy; and full confidence in the indigenous forces was always wanting. Essentially it was due to many imaginary fears that the British had to contend with so many difficulties, which could have been avoided or confidently and safely faced. During this entire period little serious attention was paid to the army reforms but soon, due to war, the army became a focus of nationalist attention. Having battered and fairly successfully assaulted the citadel of civil administration they directed their batteries at the military fortress. The inadequacy and weakness of the army policy was soon realized. Even a conservative paper like *The Times* commented in 1918 that, "it is now recognised by the most conservative experts, in the light of war experience that the demarcation between martial and non-martial races in India has been too rigidly drawn". The Montagu-Chelmsford report announced that, "if he (the Indian soldier) is otherwise qualified, race should no more deter him from promotion in the army than in civil service; nor do we believe it impossible to carry this principle into effect without sacrificing military considerations", and that "the British commissions have for the first time being granted to Indian

officers. The problem of commissions is one that bristles with difficulties. Government after government have considered and found no solution, but the war afforded convenient opportunity for making a definite break with the past, and a beginning, that may be fruitful of large consequences, has been made."

Vast and profound changes were noticeable in all the spheres of national activity. New forces came into play which augured the growth of a new country. By 1880 the educational policy of the government began to bear abundant fruit. The universities were turning out graduates in increasing numbers who could use the English language as well as Englishmen, and to whom the English language and English ideas were a chain to unite, among many diversities in life. Young students went to England and other European countries for study and entered many professions especially the Bar. The sub-continent was the largest country in which free-trade prevailed. Indian capital showed signs of mobility, wealth began to circulate and the traditional habit of hoarding began to disappear. Foreign capital began to pour in, now that the country had settled down to peaceful development. Natural rivalry between local capitalism and European capitalism, working and thriving under government patronage began to appear. New classes grew up and the old ones began to

die out. A potential middle-class was in the process of formation consisting of the new owners of agricultural land, and of the urban property; merchants, lawyers, doctors, journalists and so on. The urban middle classes assumed leadership of the industrial proletariat. Many avenues were opened for a private citizen to prosper if he had patience and perseverance about him. The country was growing to be a fine mixture of the modern, the mediaeval and the ancient, of the East and the West, in every aspect of life. It came within the orbit of world conditions and national politics ceased to be purely national.

Nationalism in the country took shape from 1885. It was a response of the English Educated sub-continent to the political philosophy of Burke, Bentham, Spencer, Bright and Mill. The new intellectual classes became saturated with Victorian ideas and doctrines. Young men went beyond the borders of their country studying, travelling, observing the development of institutions in various countries and noticing the progress of nations. They brought the newest of Western theories and the latest trends of Western thought. They began to snap the old bonds and create a new world in their country. Swami Vivekananda, having returned from the Chicago Congress of Religions, advised the Hindus, "With all my love for India, and with all my patriotism and

veneration for the ancients, I cannot but think that we have to learn many things from the world. We must be always ready to sit at the feet of all to learn great lessons; for, mark you, everyone can teach us great lessons...... At the same time we must not forget that we have also to teach a great lesson to the world. We cannot do without the world outside India; it was our foolishness that we thought we could, and we have paid the penalty by about a thousand years of slavery. That we did not go out to compare things with other nations, did not mark the workings that have been all round us, has been the one great cause of this degradation of the Indian mind. All such foolish ideas that Indians must not go out of India are childish; they must be knocked on the head; the more you go out and travel among the nations of the world, the better for you and your country. If you had done that for hundreds of years past, you would not be here today at the feet of every country that wants to rule India. The first manifest effect of life is expansion. You must expand if you want to live. The moment you have ceased to expand, death is upon you, danger is ahead. I went to America and Europe, to which you so kindly allude; I had to go because that is the first sign of the revival of national life—expansion".

Nationalism in the country in the beginning had nothing anti-British about it, as a

matter of fact it grew under the British influence—indeed a great tribute to Britain. Every aspect of life developed with the imitation of English political institutions sports, manners, and the study of the English language, literature, history and philosophy became very widely spread. The days of physical fight were over, and the country learnt new lessons from England. Mayhew says that, "unrest among the educated in India is not discontent with what has been given, but a lively anticipation of further favours. And it is largely the work of the men who in our schools and colleges have learned through the study of Western history and literature not too little but dangerously much of the psychology of their English rulers, and who have been able to supplement such knowledge by what they have seen or read of modern English life and thought." Dadabhai Naoroji informed people of the country that "Agitation is the life and soul of the whole political, social and industrial history of England. The life of England, is all agitation....Agitation is the civilised peaceful weapon of normal force, and infinitely more preferable to brute physical force, when possible. Agitate, agitate over the whole length and breadth of India, peacefully of course, if we mean really to get justice from John Bull. Satisfy him that we are in earnest. The Bengalis, I am glad, have learnt the lesson and led the march...... Agitate means inform. Inform the Indian

people what their rights are, and why and how they should obtain them."

The psychological attitude of the people to the British rule and of the British to the indigenous people could not be easily set aside in this process of evolution. It remains a key for the comprehension of various intricate problems. Certain sad and lamentable features became visible in social life long before the Mutiny. Mr. Mayhew quotes a contemporary witness on the state of British society in the sub-continent who wrote "visitors in Calcutta are merely on their way out to make their fortune, or on their way home because they have made it, or because their health requires change of station and they come to ask for it."[1] The social gulf between the people of the country and the English governing classes began to grow. The conditions of life in which the people and the British could have connections between them on terms of equality no longer existed. Sir Charles Metcalfe had long realized this phenomenon with alarm, and while leaving the country he declared, "I greatly lament that a difference in relation and customs should operate....to prevent the benefits of social intercourse between the native and European communities in India—I trust that time will effect this desirable result and remove the obstacles which retard it." The Hon. Emily Eden wrote that, "Queen

1. "Christianity and the Government of India."

Adelaide and O'Connell, the Jerseys and Pembrokes are not further apart and more antipathetic than European and native."

This tendency was marked by the directors of the East India Company with justifiable alarm. The Mutiny had left the two communities increasingly bitter. In a resolution protesting against the extinction of the Company they deprecated the unsocial feelings "among our countrymen in India and at home" evoked by the Mutiny. Power had corrupted British social life in the country. All the observers of the time testified to the moral degeneracy in the British community in the country. Christianity among them had acquired the significance merely as a "superficial fashion of speech". Official arrogance and racial pretentions of superiority were deliberately injected into the new members of the Indian civil service who came to the country. Sir Henry Cotton recording his experiences writes, "ten years have elapsed since the Mutiny...... when I first arrived in the country it was duly enjoined on me as a matter of vital importance that I should insist on all the outward and visible signs of deference and respect, which orientals with a leaning to psychophancy, resulting from generations of subjection and foreign rule are only too willing to accord". Lord Cromer alluded to the indifference noticeable among the Europeans towards acquiring the knowledge of indigenous

vernaculars and the growing dependence on the English educated nationals of the country who were no longer willing collaborators in the administration of their country. Even Lord Curzon was disturbed at the increasing social antipathy between the rulers and the ruled and in 1902 he, pontifically declared, "you cannot do without us. We should be impotent without you. Let the Englishman and the Indian accept the consecration of a union that is so mysterious as to have in it something of the divine, and let our common ideal be a united country and a happier people." It seemed that the time was not yet ripe for such exhortations to be effective ; for a happier social relationship the two countries had still to wait for certain noble souls to appear to soothe passions and heal wounds.

It was during this period that the subcontinent became a focus of foreign attention. Many nations realized what harm they could do to England by taking advantage of this social antagonism. National sentiments were exploited to create political resentment. The British Empire they thought could only be exploded from within. People from the subcontinent migrated to countries overseas and they found themselves confronted by what Lord Hardinge described "invidious and unjust laws". A number of world events occurred in quick succession which tremendously increased social and political excitement. Political extremism took shape and the

number of irreconcilables began to grow. The war created new conditions in the country and at once converted it into a volcano.

The tendency of the British administration during this period was to favour the aristocracy. Meredith Townsend informs us that during the British rule (true to the traditions of previous empires) the peasants "were the stakes in the game, not the players. It is for the right of taxing them that all Indian revolutions, wars, invasions, movements of all kinds have occurred". Lord Canning followed the precedent of Cornwallis and made further effort to maintain the indigenous landed artistocracy on the English model. He tried to carry this idea further by conferring magisterial powers on the Zamindars. Lord Lytton described the country's intellectuals as "a deadly legacy from Metcalfe and Macaulay". Efforts were made to revitalize the Muslim aristocracy and in pursuit of that policy he personally opened the Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh. Lord Curzon followed the same policy; and Lord Morley wrote to Lady Minto "the truth is that I am an occidental, not an oriental........I think I like Indian Mohammadans, but I cannot go much farther in the Easterly direction". The new land-holding classes began to look to the government for all kind of support and the result was the widening of the gulf between the Zamindars

1. "Asia and Europe."

and the peasantry. The aristocracy deriving its strength from the bureaucracy became deficient in graces, alien to the people and oppressive in its way. On the other hand the spread of English education increased the middle class intelligentsia who, being bitter against the bureaucracy, directed their effort, to winning over the poor and illiterate masses who stood ominously exposed to exploitation of all kinds.

After the Mutiny the Hindu-Muslim problem of recent years began to take shape. The Mutiny had left the Muslims in a tragic mood and they were very bitter against the Hindus, who they said had let them down. It was the Muslims who had suffered most in the revolution that had taken place in the country. They were calm, sullen and full of despair. Urdu poetry of the period displays their pessimism and their utter helplessness. Their only consolation was to visualize the glories of their past generations. It was this deep-rooted pride in their past which sustained them. The Muslim was in a disturbed mood. He was governed by convulsions. His recklessness and irresponsibility carried a certain brilliance and arrogance; his helplessness made him impatient with and militant against everything. For the Muslims the Mutiny ushered in the period of gloom, despair and futility. They stood badly in need of a man who could tame the shrew.

The Muslims had continuously suffered for nearly one hundred and fifty years. Now they began to show signs of awakening after merciless buffeting by events. Their attitude to the British changed from that of hostility into confidence. Sir John Strachey wrote that: "The Mohammadan gentleman who remembers the position his ancestors once held, accepts with natural regret, but with no humiliation, the government of Englishmen. Although he may not love them he admits they may be respected". In the address to Lord Ripon in 1884 the Aligarh Committee declared that: "The time has happily passed when the Mohammadans of India looked upon their condition as hopeless, when they regarded the past with feelings of mournful sorrow. Their hopes are now inclined to the promise of the future, their hearts full of loyalty to the rule of the Queen-Empress, aspire to finding distinction and prominence among the various races of the vast empire, over which Her Majesty holds sway. It is to help the realisation of these aspirations that this college has been founded, and we fervently hope that among the results which may flow from our system of education, not the least important will be the promotion of friendly feelings of social intercourse and interchange of amenities of life, between the English community in India and the Mohammadan population". Sir Sayyid Ahmad boldy informed the Muslims, "Be not unjust to that nation which is ruling over you, and think of

this—how upright is her rule. Of such benevolence as the English government shows to the foreign nations under her rule there is no example ın the history of the world". Advising the Muslims to join the Army though they could not aspire to any commissioned ranks he pathetically appealed to them: "Oh brothers, I have fought the government in the harshest language about these points. The time is however, coming when my brothers, Pathans, Sayyids, Hashimis and Quraishis whose blood smells of the blood of Abraham will appear in glittering uniforms as Colonels and Majors in the army". Sir Sayyid was taming the shrew.

At this very stage when the Hindus began to recoil against the Western influences, a movement to the West began among the Muslim. A rationalist movement began which stressed the importance of modern rationalism in the interpretation of the Quran. When the Aligarh College was opened Sir Sayyid Ahmad declared that thepurpose of the College was to produce men who would preach "the gospel of free enquiry, of large-hearted tolerance and of pure morality". Sir Sayyid declared "Cure the root and the tree wıll flourish ". They realized that English education could be usefully applied for their social amelioration. "We should lay bare before the rising generation the treasures concealed in ancient Arabic lore with a view to developing the spiritual and emotional side of their nature";

and we believe English education to "be necessary for the true development of our principles and ultimate spiritual unity of our faith" and "our loyalty to the Throne must be absolute". English education was meant to be a vehicle for intimate intercourse with the Muslim world which had diminished to vanishing point during the past three-quarters of a century. The Rt. Hon. Sir Sayyid Ameer Ali declared that the Muslims of the sub-continent: "Are connected by ties of religion, tradition and race with the whole of Western Asia and Northern Africa, right away to the Atlantic—countries where the prestige of England stands high, and where England is recognised as the champion of justice and fair play"; and to establish the link again was the pious effort of very Muslim.

Sir Sayyid took a very firm stand with regard to the political future of the Muslims. He became very much alarmed at the incessant demands of the Hindus for the introduction of the British Parliamentary representative institutions in the country. Sir Sayyid informed the Muslims how the introduction of such institutions would affect them. He opposed the effort of the Congress which had already begun its active political work. He put greater confidence in the British than the Hindus. He openly denied that the Muslims, "The men of the blood of those who made not only Arabia but Asia and Euro pe tremble, who for seven hundred years in India had

imperial sway, could be treated as belonging to the same nation as Bengalis", and he expressed his contempt for the "political nostrum" which the so-called National Congress proposed to apply to the sub-continent. Thus the Muslims were made aware of the fact that their salvation lay in living a separate existence rather than with the Hindus against whom they would have no chances to compete in case the parliamentary institutions were introduced. There were fundamental differences between the two communities which could not be easily reconciled. The Muslims had traditions and ideals of their own—traditions and ideals which have been the common heritage of all Muslims and which could in no way be identical with those of any other community. It was not merely the differences of race, of beliefs and laws, but the differences included in the form of all absence of inter-marriage, dietary prohibitions and conceptions of partiotism. So long as these barriers existed and religion continued to exercise its power and force, harmonious cooperation between the two communities was well-nigh impossible. The demand for independent recognition of their community, brought forth separate electorate for the Muslims and the separate electorate developed into the demand for Pakistan.

Sir Alfred Lyall commenting on the position of the Muslims in relation to the British rule wrote, "Orderly Christian rule has

given to Islam in India an opportunity for becoming regenerated and for reuniting its strength, which it owes entirely to us. We have restored its communications by sea and by land; we have already felt some of the consequences of pulling down the barriers which Ranjit Singh and his Sikhs set upon our North-Western Frontier and the rest of Western Asia. Mohammadanism may yet occupy a larger space in the history of the Indian Nationalism, but it must make haste or the country may drift beyond it". Yes, the Muslims were in real haste. They showed new vigour and activity. They were fifty years behind the Hindus when the twentieth century began and within a decade they were strong enough to stand against any forces that would have the sinister purpose of obliterating them. The original ideals of the Islamic life began to govern them again. In them religion again inspired the old conceptions of religious nationalism. The spirit of Islam was in revolt and its surging forth was only a matter of a few years.

It was really a curious phenomenon that while the government tried to patronize the aristocracy to build up a strong political class to stand by it, it was actually the new intellectual and economic middle classes which showed a strong flair for social and political activity. Instead of the landed aristocracy to back the government there arose this middle class with the means, the will and the capacity

to check the powers of the government. With the rise of the middle class, which was detected even in the first half of the nineteenth century but which became conspicuous in the second half of it, dawned a new era in the life of the people. The old economic system was fast falling into decay and instead of that, modern wholesale trade, and finance capital were substituted. The old classes like the priests, the degenerate aristocracy which had monopolised the leadership of the country before began to fade away and the leadership was assumed by the typical classes of our time—the merchants, the lawyers, the men of letters, the students, the journalists and other people of the middle class professions. These new classes were energetic and restless and saturated with all kinds of revolutionary ideas. Having learnt the lessons of political agitation very well they began to organise public opinion—it was between these middle classes and the bureaucracy that the actual fight began.

All the events of the time, the activities of the government and the aspirations of the people found their culmination in the regime of Lord Ripon. This liberal disciple of Mr. Gladstone repealed the vernacular press acts, introduced a scheme of local self-government and attempted certain reforms to let the steam of indigenous opinion out; and even by taking these small steps he endeared himself to the people of the country. He became the most beloved Viceroy who ever came to rule over

the destinies of the sub-continent. The scheme of the Ilbert Bill (known after Sir Courtny Ilbert, law member of the administration of Lord Ripon) was meant "to remove at once and completely every judicial qualification based merely on race distinction". That it could not be carried through became ominous. The bill at once precipitated and crystallized many issues, the most important being that of equality in the administration of criminal law concerning the Europeans and the people of the country. The opposition of the European and the Anglo-Indian communities to being tried by local judges made the educated classes of the country conscious of their inferiority and subjection. The controversy that raged round the Ilbert Bill created a great deal of bitterness in both camps. The proposals were declared by the Europeans to be imperilling "their liberties in India". The peoples of the country on their part at once became conscious of the disunity that existed among themselves. The failure of the efforts of the Viceroy evoked racial hostility among the two communities. It was for the first time clear that bureaucratic order was powerful enough to thwart and capable enough to frustrate even the most just and liberal attempts of the British government. Confidence was along absent and now even all hopes were lost to obtain justice from the Government. There was no coherent opposition in the country, the Ilbert Bill brought it into existence.

The result of the opposition of the Europeans to the Ilbert Bill was the Indian National Congress. That the country had entered upon a period of change was clear to Lord Ripon. The spread of English education, the influence of the press, the facilities in the means of communications and the influx of English ideas of government and society began to bear natural fruit. Not English ideas alone but Englishmen too began to contribute to the country's peaceful development and well-being. Mr. Hume found a dangerous state of unrest and anti-governmental activity in the country which convinced him that unless steps were taken to check it, a rising bigger than the Mutiny would any time be possible. Opposition, which had gone undergound after the Mutiny, began to show signs of activity again. The national movement was started to work as a safety valve for people's outbursts and also to give the movement for political reforms a peaceful and loyalist tinge. Mr. Hume himself unequivocally put it down that "knowing the country and the people as I do—having been through on a smaller scale in the Mutiny—and having convinced myself that the evidence of the existing state of the proletariat was real and trustworthy, I could not then, and I do not now, doubt that we were then truly in extreme danger of a most terrible revolution". He and Lord Ripon were convinced that the forces that were active then, were charged with such potential dangers that neither blind indiffe-

rence to them nor their stupid repression would prove of any avail. The idea of Mr. Hume was that it was "of paramount importance to find an overt and constitutional channel for discharge of the increasing ferment which had resulted from Western ideas and education", instead of leaving the whole lava boiling underground which would one day erupt with a devastating suddenness.

The first meeting of the National Congress took place in December, 1885, and the invitation said that "indirectly this conference will form the germ of a native Parliament, and, if properly conducted, will constitute in a few years an unanswerable reply to the assertion that India is still wholly unfit for any form of representative institutions". The first President of the Congress declared that their object was "the eradication, by direct, friendly, personal intercourse, of all possible race, or creed or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consideration of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in our beloved Lord Ripon's memorable reign", and that Britain had given them "the benefit of Western education. But the more progress a people made in education and material prosperity, the greater would be their insight into political matters and the keener their desire for political advancement". Here was the first meeting of its kind in the history of the country when people had felt the need of

putting their heads together to tackle common issues. The gorgeous, spectacular and novel scene of this gathering has been portrayed for us thus:— "All these men assembled in the same hall, presented such a variety of costumes, and complexions, that a similar scene can scarcely be witnessed anywhere except at a fancy dress ball". Here was this miracle achieved by English education and English ideas. From an amorphous mass of diverse races, classes and religious denominations of the country, was created a new class and body of men with common ideas, using a common language and inspired by a sense of common interest. Indeed the sub-continent was growing to give a definite impression and put up a definite appearance.

When the Congress began its activities there was nothing anti-governmental about it. It generally met either to present petitions, or pass resolutions and thank the government. Sir William Hunter said: "I affirm that there is no political movement in the country which is managed with the same moderation of speech and the same dignity of procedure as this, the Indian National Congress". Dadabhai Naoroji declared in 1886 at Calcutta: "It is under the civilizing rule of the Queen and the people of England that we meet together, hindered by none and allowed to speak our minds without the least fear and the least hesitation. Such a thing is possible under British rule only —We are thoroughly sen-

sible to the numberless blessings conferred upon us, of which the very existence of this Congress is a proof in a nutshell". Even Mr. Morley was favourably disposed towards it. On the occasion of the Budget debate in 1906 he declared: "Then there is the Congress. I do not say that I agree with all that it desires. But, speaking broadly of what I conceive to be at the bottom of the Congress, I do not see why anyone who takes a cool and steady view of Indian government should be frightened. I will not at once conclude that, because a man is dissatisfied and discontented, he must be disaffected. Why, our own reforms and changes have been achieved by dissatisfied men, who were no more disaffected than you or I". The attitude of the government was explained by an official letter in 1890 which read. "The government of India recognise that the Congress movement is regarded as representing what would in Europe be called the advanced liberal party, as distinguished from the great body of conservative opinion which exists side by side with it. They desire themselves, to maintain an attitude of neutrality in their relations with both parties, so long as these act strictly within their constitutional functions".

Many Englishmen were actively associated with the growth and the strength of the Congress. Mr. Hume, as General Secretary of the Congress, travelled throughout the country at his own expense and tried to

popularize it. Some of the early presidents of the Congress were Sir Henry Cotton (1904), Sir William Wedderburn (1910). Mr. Charles Bradlaugh while addressing the Congress declared in an ecstatic mood "for whom would I work if not for the people? Born of the people, trusted by the people, I will die for the people, and know no geographical or racial limitations". Initially there was official support too. Lord Macdonnell in 1891 publicly declared that he had no objection to anyone joining the Congress. In 1914 Lord Pentland, the Governor of Madras attended the Congress Session and in 1916 Lord Meston, the Governor of United Provinces addressed the Lucknow Session. In England the British Committee of the Congress was formed and they began publishing a journal 'India' to stimulate public interest in the country's affairs. Among the active workers in England were Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Hume, Mr. Digby, Lord Clwyd, Sir Henry Cotton, Lord Hewart (some time Lord Chief Justice of England) and many others. Indeed the part that some of the Englishmen, associated with nationalist activities had played was admirable. They helped not only in the regeneration of the country but judiciously guided the nationalist movements which were always in mortal danger of many separatist tendencies from within. Their great work will never be forgotten in the writing of history.

Very soon the negative and suspicious attitude of the bureaucracy became noticeable. Many a time British official and non-official sections found themselves united in opposition to the people's demands and aspirations. It was this growing apathy of the bureaucracy which forced the Congress into active opposition. The bureaucrats described the activities of the English supporters of the nationalist movement as those of "veiled seditionists." Against their charges of sedition came a reply from Mr. Norton, who declared, "if it be sedition gentlemen to rebel against all wrong; if it be sedition to insist that people should have a fair share in the administration of their own country and affairs, if it be sedition to resist class tyranny, to raise my voice against oppression, to mutiny against injustice, to ins st upon hearing before sentence, to uphold the liberties of the individual, to vindicate our common right to gradual but ever advancing reform—if this be sedition, I am right glad to be called a seditionist and doubly, aye trebly, glad when I look round me today to know and feel I am ranked as one among such a magnificent array of seditionists". But in spite of the fact that the Congress was dubbed as a "microscopic minority" and not a "voice of the people" it continued to be peaceful, it simply put forth demands for reforms, and criticised the despotic bureaucracy without, in any way, seriously opposing the British rule. The Congress was still acknowledged by the

Nationalists as "the soundest triumph of British administration" and "a crown of glory to the British nation".

The Nationalists tried initially to argue and appeal to the government. To the allusions that they were only a small educated class of the people—a very small ratio of the country's population who wanted reforms—came the reply "it is perfectly correct that the ignorant classes whom we seek to represent are still unable in many provinces to take an active interest in the many social and administrative problems which are now engaging the attention of the educated classes; but history teaches us that in all countries and in all ages it is the thinking who lead the unthinking, and we are bound to think for ourselves and others who are still too ignorant to exercise that important function". Sir Surendranath Banerjea explained the attitude of nationalism by telling a London audience: "We believe in our cause, we believe that persistency in constitutional agitation will culminate in the triumph of that cause, and above all we believe in the sense of justice and sense of liberty of the English people. We shall, therefore, continue this agitation and with your help and under God's guidance we are bound to win in the noblest contest that has ever warmed the hearts or inspired the energies of men". But at this very time when the politicians and leaders of the country thought in terms of peaceful and gradual

development in political life, it was getting increasingly clear that the bureaucracy would not let them remain peaceful but would force them into extremism.

Times were fast changing and in the sub-continent events were occurring with a bewildering succession. What the country wanted, was put forth by Mr. Gokhale by saying "I recognise no limits to my aspirations for our motherland. I want our people to be in their own country what other people are in theirs. I want our countrymen and women without distinction of caste and creed to have opportunities to grow to the full height of their status, unhampered by cramping and unnatural restrictions. I want India to take her proper place among the great nations of the world politically, industrially, in religion, in literature, in science and in arts. I want all this and feel at the same time that the whole can, in its essence and reality, be realized within this empire". But the views of veteran liberals like Gokhale went unheeded by the bureaucracy—the only form of government whose memory is notoriously short. Instead of facing the problems boldly and realistically, their opinion ran in the opposite direction. Aspirations for self-government were characterized as disloyalty to the rule, people's claims to enjoy a large share in the governance of their own country were looked upon with scorn and derision, until even liberals

and moderates of the type of Gokhale began to view the bureaucracy as a determined opponent and inveterate enemy of the legitimate aspirations and cherished ambitions of the people. Giving his evidence before the Royal Commission in 1897 he said: "The excessive costliness of the foreign agency is not, however, its only evil. There is a moral evil which, if anything, is even greater. A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied".

In the first decade of the twentieth century, all the liberal and moderate elements in national life were overwhelmed with frustration and disappointment, due to the apathy of the government to all their legitimate demands. All faith in constitutional agitation which Mr. Hume and the liberals had advocated was lost because the machinery of reform moved very slowly. It was rightly concluded that the government still believed in maintaining a monopoly of power; and this conclusion gave rise to an extremist class in nationalist movements. The extremists wanted the Congress to leave its "tortoise-like gait" and abandon its "policy of mendicancy" and turn itself into a "living and active body". In 1914 Mrs. Besant came to the country and joined the extremist propaganda,

favouring nationalism and vehemently attacking the government. With the collaboration of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Tilak, nationalism became definitely militant and pugnacious. It was explained in the Montagu-Chelmsford report that: "There exists a small revolutionary party deluded by hatred of British rule and desire for the elimination of Englishmen into the belief that the path to independence or political liberty lies through anarchical crime". Thus the principles of government and the aspirations of the governed came in direct conflict. It was declared that British rule had withheld political liberty and conceded some civil liberty—and the nationalists valued the former more than latter. Political struggle seemed to be a cementing force, and social ideas seemed to be a dividing force so they had better not talk about them. The letter of a President of the Congress in 1895 to the National Social Conference read: "The *raison d'etre* for excluding the social questions from our deliberations is that if we were to take up such questions, it might lead to serious differences, ultimately culminating in a schism, and it is a matter of the first importance to prevent a split."

Thus national demands insistent and resonant stood in direct opposition to the peaceful continuation of political authority. The liberals too began to feel helpless in this new situation in which extremism was gaining

the upper hand. A liberal organ wrote: "In nearly all parts of India where political life is earnest, certain persons have of late been preaching a crusade againt the older leaders. The younger Congressmen have been made to believe that, if only, they crippled these and laid them on the shelf, the principal obstacle in the way of India's progress would be removed. We do not grudge the new leaders their success. Far be it from us to do so. But it is to be wished that their success was attained by methods which left the young heart pure and tender and chivalrous, and which did not rob it of the rare jewel of ancient Indian Culture, the quality of reverence. The renovated polity of the future cannot lose it except at its peril." A liberal president of the Congress appealed to the Government to see things realistically. He warned, "if the government can only rally the moderates to their side, by gradually preparing the country to take its position as a self-governing state or a federation of states under the supreme authority of England, they will extinguish the new party completely, and the ominous shadow which had projected itself over the future fortunes of the country will completely disappear. Is it not a curious blunder, which, in politics, we all know is worse than crime, to denounce the whole educated class as disloyal? Such denunciations have sometimes a fatal tendency to realize themselves. I repeat we are not crying for the moon. I repeat that we ask

only that our country should take her rightful place among the nations under the aegis of England. We want in reality and not in mere name to be sons of the Empire. Our ambition is to draw closer to England and to be absorbed in that greater Britain in which we now have no place. The ideal after which we are striving is autonomy within the Empire and not absolute independence."

So with the dawning of the twentieth century there emerged, two schools of thought in the nationalist movement—the one liberal believing in patience, in gradualness, in steps by lawful means and lawful agitation and in constitutionalism; and the other extremist, rejecting all cooperation with government seeking to acquire independence by terrorism and anarchism, and by breaking every established institution of administration. The transformation that had taken place during one single generation can be well judged from the fact that Mr. Subramania Aiyar, Nationlist leader, moving a resolution at the first session of the Congress declared. "By a merciful dispensation of Providence, India which was for centuries the victim of external aggression and plunder, of internal civil wars and general confusion, has been brought under the dominion of the great British power, I need not tell you how that event introduced a great change in the destiny of her people, how the inestimable good that has flowed from it has been appreciated by them. The rule of

Great Britain has, on the whole, been better in its results and direction than any former rule. Without descanting at length upon the benefits of that rule, I can summarise them in one remarkable fact that for the first time in the history of the Indian population there is to be beheld the phenomenon of national unity among them, of a sense of national existence." Nearly thirty years later the same gentleman wrote to President Wilson: "Permit me to add that you and the other leaders have been kept in ignorance of the full measure of misrule and oppression in India. Officials of an alien nation, speaking a foreign tongue, force their will upon us; they grant themselves exorbitant salaries, and large allowances; they refuse us education; they sap us of our wealth; they impose crushing taxes without our consent; they cast thousands of our people into prisons for uttering patriotic sentiments—prisons so filthy that often the inmates die from loathsome diseases".

All this time the Congress increasingly grew up as a Hindu body in every way monopolised by Bengali hot-heads. For all practical purposes the Muslims were conspicuous by their dissociation from it. With the revivalist tendencies in Hinduism, the tone of the Congress too became characteristically Hindu. It was getting increasingly clear that the attitude of the Congress extremists was not only anti-government but it was also

assuming an anti-Muslim tone. Mr. Tilak started his cult of Ganapati and put Hinduism on the horse-back. In his paper *Kesari* he carried on reckless propaganda against the Muslims; and it was at once discovered by them—as if by way of miracle—that the British had conquered the country not from the Muslims but from the Hindus, and that they alone were the rightful owners of the sub-continent. The Congress extremists began to stigmatise the Muslims as usurpers, intruders and foreigners (later, following Hitlerite vocabulary, even as "Jews"); and complete elimination of the British and the Muslims became the object of their activities and propaganda. They even became bold enough to use the word Hindu as synonymous with "Indian" and talk about "Indian civilization" meaning the Hindu civilization. The very name of a Muslim to the Hindu revivalists became an anathema. And on top of all they declared "Neo-Vedantism demands of social and economic and a political reconstruction such as will be helpful to the spiritual note of the present individual member of the community. The spiritual note of the present nationalist movement in India is entirely derived from this Vedantic thought". The note was indeed struck. By talking about Vedantism and nationalism simultaneously even if not synonymously the Hindus had committed the mistake of showing a red rag to the Muslim bull—they threw the Muslims right into the arms of the British.

Vedantism was something which was abominable to a Muslim. With the Vedas he associates not only absurdities and profanities but also most horrible conceptions of the human being and God which he could not countenance at any cost. Talk of the Vedas to a Muslim, and even a sensible argument, he would refuse to listen. Thus the Muslims began to get suspicious of the Hindu nationalist designs. The Muslim opposition to the Congress began in 1888. Muslims like Sir Sayyid Ahmad showed open contempt for the Congress activities. In the characteristic attitude of the time Sir Sayyid preferred the British to the Hindus—he would collaborate with the British administration but would never tolerate the Hindu domination. The Muslims began to attribute all the disasters that had fallen on them—even the loss of their political supremacy—to Hindu activities. It was declared that the Mutiny had been started by the Hindus, and the Muslims with their traditional impetuosity rushed into it and came out of it battered and burned. The Muslims like Sir Sayyid predicted and warned that if the British yielded to the Hindu demands Civil War would be the unavoidable consequence. In order to combat the Congress propaganda a tangible step was taken in the formation of the Anglo-Mohammadan Defence Association by Sir Sayyid Ahmad and Sir Auckland Colvin, in order to create political consciousness among the Muslims, and to remind them that their

interests would never be safe in the hands of the Congress. Sir Sayyid died in 1898, but by that time the Muslims had taken to heart the words of Mazzini who was of the opinion that universal suffrage and represenative institutions "in a country governed by a common faith is the expression of the national will; but in a country deprived of a common belief, what can it be but a mere expression of the interest of those numerically stronger, to the oppression of all the rest". Sir Theodore Morrison analysed the position better. He wrote. "It is apparently necessary for English politicians to behold a country given up to anarchy before they can realize that the popular institutions make for the disruption of a nation which is not yet compact and unified. If they looked beneath the delusive calm which the army maintains in India, they would behold all the passions which beget Civil War, unscotched by a hundred years of unwilling peace".

Just when the British Government was contemplating new reforms, the Muslims formed the all India Muslim League on Ist October, 1906. A Muslim deputation led by Agha Khan met Lord Minto, the Viceroy, and put forth the Muslim point of view with regard to various problems facing the country and the Government. Thus the Muslims too got prepared to face any situation that might arise. Now the country had two distinct nationalist movements.

Another factor of a very great importance had come into play in the country, with increasing force and effectiveness. The entire shape of things in the country was changing due to the political consciousness, quickened by the spread of English education and by the growing familiarity of the people of India with Western thought and Western movements. But the single factor which could be said to have contributed the biggest share to this awakening was the press. The only pre-Mutiny paper which could be called a precursor of the post-Mutiny papers was the *Reformer* of Mr. P. K. Tagore established in 1831. Soon after the Mutiny the press became increasingly aggressive against the administration and assumed a tone which could be said to have been in opposition to the Government. By 1879 there were nearly twenty newspapers in English and the number of Vernacular papers rose to a hundred or so. The part that the press had begun to play—which was blasphemous and abominable for the bureaucracy—was described by Sir Henry Maine by saying; "We are beginning more and more to be conscious of the reflex action of Indian opinion; which is mainly formed by the newspapers, which penetrate to England in a variety of ways; which thus leavens or creates English opinion about India, and so becomes a real power with which we have to count".

The tone of the press in the sub-continent soon became fairly disturbing and annoying for the bureaucracy to tolerate. An early step was taken in 1857 by Lord Canning 'To gag' the press as he said, and thus the Act was nicknamed the Gagging Act. In 1878 the tone of the press became increasingly sharp and acute and Lord Lytton prepared to disarm the people and gag the vernacular press. Introducing the Vernacular Press Act of April 1878 (which was passed at one and the same sitting of the Imperial Legislature. The law member of the Government declared, "But there is a large and increasing class of native newspapers which would seem to exist only for the sake of spreading seditious principles, of bringing the government and its European officers into contempt, and of exciting antagonism between the governing race and the people of the country. This description of writing is not of very recent growth, but there has been a marked increase in it of late, and specially during the last three or four years. During the last twelve months it has been worse than ever, the writers gaining in boldness as they find that their writings are allowed to pass unpunished. Their principal topics are the injustice and tyranny of the British government, its utter want of consideration towards its native subjects, and the insolence and pride of Englishmen in India, both official and non-official. There is no crime however heinous, and no meanness however vile which accor-

ding to these writers is not habitually practised by their English rulers". A distinction was made between the English and the vernacular papers on principle that the former were a support to the British rule, so beneficial, and the latter were a danger to the administration, so mischievous and seditious. It was an official argument for the maintenance of this discrimination that the English papers were addressed to the people who were intelligent, and learned whereas the vernacular papers were addressed to the ignorant, excitable and helpless classes in the country.

Lord Ripon repealed the press laws of 1857 and 1878 (the Arms Act was maintained intact) and after that in dealing with the Indian Press, a section of the Indian Penal Code was applied to control it. During the years of the great war Lord Chelmsford while piously declaring that: "Anything in the nature of muzzling the press strikes right across the grain of my whole being" told the press deputation that waited on him, "In 1878 a growing section of the Indian Press was expressing overt or open hostility to the government. The passing of the Act of that year exercised a restraining influence, but when it was removed there was a recrudescence of malevolent hostility. From 1884 to 1898 a section of the press steadily grew more scurrilous, more malignant, more seditious, until the penal law had to be strengthened in 1898, but even that was not sufficient.

Misrepresentation and vilification of the government, and even overt sedition, went steadily on until the newspapers Excitement to Violence Act was passed in 1908, and it was only when that proved inadequate that the press Act of 1910 now under discussion, really checked the flood that was spreading over the land".

Thus the development of the press in the country took place as an undesirable intrusion in the teeth not only of the Company's opposition, but also of the opposition of the Crown Administration. The press in the country grew up to be a link between the peoples of the country and the British people, between the ruled and the British Parliament, and between the subjects and the British Administration. The press was the only institution, in the hands of the people to ventilate their public grievances. It grew up as a permanent opposition to the government; mercilessly and vehemently criticising its activities in order to extract reforms, and to effect changes. The importance of the press in the country can be judged from the fact that there were nearly 3500 various kinds of newspapers, and periodicals published in the country, in seventeen or more different languages in 1935.

The policy advocated by the great administrators like Elphinstone in the first quarter of the nineteenth centutry was only

hesitatingly followed in the last quarter of it. Elphinstone had advised "retaining the government and the military power, but gradually relinquishing all share in civil administration except that degree of control which is necessary to give the whole an impulse and direction. This operation must be so gradual that it need not even alarm the directors for their civil patronage. But it ought to be kept in mind that all our measures ought to tend to that object. The first steps are to commence a systematic education of the natives for civil offices, to make over to them at once a large share of judicial business, to increase their emoluments gradually and to open a few high prizes for the most able and honest among them. The period when they may be admitted into council seems to be distant". Why it was convenient and least harmful to transfer judicial business to subject peoples became plain from the opinion of two other administrators. In the opinion of Sir John Malcolm, the Law Courts were a useless luxury and he went on to say "I have tried to deal some heavy blows at these costly and dangerous fabrics *yclept* supreme courts; but they are too essential for the objects of power and patronge, and to feed the rising spirit of the age, for me or any man to prevail against them". Lord William Bentinck considered the law courts as "resting places for those members of the

service who were deemed unfit for higher responsibilities".[1]

The policy advocated by Elphinstone was at last inaugurated, and increasing share was given to people in the judicial administration. It was in the law courts that the foundations of revolution were laid. It looked immensely surprising and bewildering to the administration that any harmless and innocent straw that it touched and shook in order to relax its control, that straw at once produced political sparks. The transfer of judicial business was supposed to be the least harmful to the British administrative machinery, and the judicial administration was something in which it was least interested. But interestingly enough the law courts became the chief theatres for the display of indigenous talents. There grew up the profession of law which though parasitic, made the biggest contribution to national resurgence and advance. The entire political life of the country and the leadership of the communities was monopolised by the members of the profession of law. In the new scheme of administration they acquired prestige, brilliance, competence, capacity, knowledge and above all the means to stand up as honest and upright, and thereby prove a successful opposition to the official policies. The profession of law attracted the best and the finest talents in the

1. Thompson and Garratt "Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India."

country's youth. This was a field of activity in which a European could not interest himself much due to the nature of the country, the life of its people and more than all due to the constitution of the judicial administration in which the indigenous element was getting more and more predominant. The law courts opened up new opportunities for the youth and they flocked to England to study for the Bar. When they came back, they brought English ideas of justice and agitated minds. They constituted an active and comparatively free class deserving all respect and deference. Strangely enough, the judiciary was the first branch of administration to which the people of the country were admitted, and it was the judiciary more than any other department of government which created a favourable impression on the public mind. With all the defects, it must be admitted that the High Courts of justice became the only institution in the land which were said to have been built up with patience and care. Even some of the bitterest and most hostile critics of the British administration have had words of praise for the administration of justice in the country.

An amorphous system of law partly English, partly Muslim, partly Hindu, partly customary and partly whimsical—continued up to 1859 when the work of codification was taken in hand. The people of the country were "permitted to mind their own

justice" and occasionally whenever advisable, depending upon the capriciousness of an individual administrator, orders were issued which had the force of law and against which there was no source to appeal to but God. These ordinances so issued were nothing but despotic orders over-riding the provisions of any other laws if they came in conflict with them. Historically the first step towards codification was taken in 1833. A commission was set up under the Chairmanship of Lord Macaulay to work for the codification of the penal law. This monumental code, though supposed to be the work of a commission but actually the result of the effort and erudition of Lord Macaulay was prepared in 1835 but remained unenforced and unpromulgated till 1861. Lord Macaulay did immense service to the country's legal machinery. It is very amusing to find that Lord Macaulay is not so much remembered, praised and attacked by his compatriots for his contribution to the legal lore, as for his educational policy. It was the controversy that raged round the educational policy which enhanced the importance of his decision. Because the judiciary was considered either of subordinate or of little importance, so the work done by the great statesman has gone either under-estimated, or unvaluedin comparison with the pains taken by him to accomplish the task. It is little known that he was primarily a law member of the Council of the Governor-General, and not the Presi-

dent of the Board of Public Instruction. One is really surprised and amused when one comes across observations like that of Lord Acton that Macaulay "knew nothing respectably before the seventeenth century, nothing of foreign history, religion, philosophy, science or art," or like that of Mr. Mayhew that "English as a temporary medium of instruction was reasonable. English as a living and virile language was bound to influence India. But English as a substitute for the indigenous classics was doomed to disastrous failure. And Macaulay's confusion of these two aspects of English was to be equally disastrous."

In all subsequent efforts for the codification of law the principles enunciated by Lord Macaulay were kept in view. He had emphasised that in the codification of the law for the country "uniformity should be aimed at where it could be had", "diversity whereit must be had" but "certainty alone should be the chief aim". This was a salutary advice in view of the nature of the country, the constituent elements of its population and the relationship of the government with the people. Initially under parliamentary authority the Code of Civil Procedure was produced in 1859, the Code of Criminal Procedure in 1861. Later various Commissions were appointed and they produced one after another the Succession Act of 1865, the Limitation Act of 1871, the Evidence and the

Contract Act of 1872. Subsequently the work of codification was entrusted to the government of the sub-continent who produced the Specific Relief Act of 1877, the Limitation Act of 1877, the Negotiable Instruments Act of 1881, the Trust Act of 1882, the Transfer of Property Act of 1882, the Easement Act of 1882, the Indian Companies Act, 1882 and so on. In order to facilitate the application of law without the least inconvenience, the High Courts Act of 1861 was passed which simplified the judicial machinery of administration by the amalgamation of certain courts and by the abolition of others, thus the presidency High Courts of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, came into being.

The judicial had been the most complicated machinery in the country. The law courts were by statutory enactments enjoined to apply the rule of the Hindu or the Muslim personal law in their particular cases concerning succession, marriage, inheritance, and religious institutions; and when there was no specific guidance they were expected to decide on the principles of justice, equity and good conscience—which actually meant, by following English law and procedure. That there were defects in the law as it had evolved and shortcomings in the courts no one could deny; but it was also acknowledged by all that the country had come to possess certain monumental codes, and that along with the establishment of law

courts, the codification of law became one of the happy features of the British rule. In the local courts the people learnt the lessons of public administration, public morality and public rights. Never before in the history of the country was the legality of a certain action confirmed prior to attempting it.

The complexity of the laws in a country like the sub-continent must be recognised, because not only was the indigenous law personal and divisible with reference to the two greatly preponderating elements in its population—the Hindu and the Muslim—but there was a great body of customary law varying from province to province, and even from district to district. The result was that due to the influence of English jurisprudence in theory and in practice, due to the great body of case-law emanating from the law courts, modelled on the English precedents, due to the advance of ideas and education and so on, the entire system of law was being constantly subjected to modifications and alterations, which made matters very difficult and embarrassing. All these traits of law provided rather good opportunities for the members of the profession of law to indulge in subtle disputations, in almost every case relating to indigenous social life. Many a time the magistrates and the judges found themselves in very interesting predicaments, and decisions were delivered and judgements announced by them which conveyed the impression of

guess-work, based not too well on their reliable conscience.

There was a general opinion that the administration of justice was on the whole good but rather long, irksome and costly. Even in the early stages Sir John Malcolm spoke of the "vexatious and expensive litigation" that had taken root in the country. We are informed that even in the early stages of British expansion the people used to run before the marching British armies because of "the demon of High Court" accompanying or following them. It was essentially the application of the civil law which was hated and in which what the Duke of Wellington called: "The criminal tribe of lawyers" had the biggest scope to thrive. Professional lawyers had become an unavoidable necessity and evil, when the foreign system of law was introduced, and the law courts were established with complicated rules of evidence and procedure.

A lot of amusing folk-lore came into existence round the application of civil law; and litigating parties were generally expected to receive a lingering justice. It was perhaps supposed to be the most inauspicious omen for anyone to become a party to a civil suit. It was generally said that the litigating parties in a civil suit died at the doors of the courts of law and the fruits of justice—if any—were enjoyed by the next generation.

Speaking about this aspect of the law courts an observer commented: "What European firewater has been physically to the Red Indian, European Law has been morally to the Indians of the East. Millions of simple men, alike in the lower and upper provinces curse the day when they or their fathers first tasted English law; so far it is developed in our civil jurisprudence; under its forms and delays thousands of village communities, which neither force nor famine could disperse, have crumbled into dust."

During this period of peace the reorganization of finance became an urgent necessity. The East India Company depended on the land-tax to please its share-holders, to carry on its civil administration in the sub-continent and to finance its wars in and outside the country. Before the Mutiny the subject country paid tribute to Britain in various ways but after the Mutiny "England regarded trade with India, not a tribute from India but as the financial asset which counterbalances the burden of governing the country."[1] This was how Lord Cromer explained the new responsibility of the crown administration. In the characteristic Mughal fashion the land-tax was maintained as the basis of government. General Creach tells us that, "That vital importance of the land question is not understood either in England, nor even by the Government of India itself. Although legis-

1. "Ancient and Modern Imperialism."

lation about land is increasing, it is not guided by any broad policy or intimate knowledge of requirements of the dumb, teeming millions who live directly and indirectly on agriculture, and, moreover, it has become quite mechanical. The main object which the present policy has in view is to screw money out of the land. The officials who carry it out think daily more and more of this, and less and less about the condition of those who live on the land. The ever-increasing complexity of administration, its insane over-centralization, and the frequent introduction of new, unpopular and costly administrative experiments are causing continual demands for more and more money"[1]. And Col. Osburn put it: "So we sucked India dry until, English observers compared the country to a squeezed lemon.. If the Irish are to be believed, we did something of the same sort on a smaller scale in Ireland; and it is said we never hate anyone so much as those we have injured."[2]

Till "poor" Mr. James Wilson—the great founder of the 'Economist'—came to the sub-continent in 1860, the public resources of the country were administered on the most happy-go-lucky system that perhaps ever existed in any civilized country. He was sent to carry out financial reorganization and he

1. "Indian Studies."
2. "Must England lose India."

introduced the first Budget in 1860. For the first time he introduced the income-tax, and the government paper currency. Captain Baring (later Lord Cromer) who came in 1880 carried out certain further reorganization, but the basis of government finance never changed and General Creach wrote: "There has been much discussion as to whether the tax taken from agriculture is too heavy or not; certainly it is the heaviest direct tax on that industry taken in any country in the world, and the worst of it is that it maintains an ever increasing tendency." But in spite of certain innovations here and there the monopolistic tone of various budgetary arrangements remained. Taxation remained faulty. Indigenous industry had no protection against foreign competition. The country, its industry and its finance were subordinated to the cotton industry of Manchester, to the jute capitalists of Scotland, and to the "economic imperialism" of the Bank of England. The country's revenues were still spent on unknown and undivulged items of expenditure, on secret services, on "Territorial and Political pensions," and on unnecessary undertakings from which no return could be expected and which were a luxury which a poverty-stricken country could not bear. The country's finance was given some sort of form, but it lacked all traits of the finance of a modern state; and the happy-go-lucky mentality of the administration had not changed in any way.

The following observation by Sir Richard Strachey adequately sums up the case for us. Sir Richard declared: "The distribution of the public income degenerated into something like a scramble, in which the most violent had the advantage, with very little attention to reason; as local economy brought no local advantage, the stimulus to avoid waste was reduced to a minimum, and as no local growth of the income led to local means of improvement, the interest in developing the public revenues was also brought down to the lowest level."

With all the ostensible progress the country was making, it seemed that the miseries of the people were simultaneously increasing —of course contributory causes were many, not one. Restlessness and resentment crept into indigenous life. The war gave a push to the unanimous demands that British rule should fall in line with the progressive ideas of the world and tackle all the problems which were so badly neglected. It was repeatedly emphasised on all hands, that any prolonged neglect of the people's problems would bring misery to the people, and present great difficulties for the government. All the abuses in the indigenous life had become deep-rooted and chronic. It was suggested that the bureaucracy in its very nature was incompetent to face these problems, it lacked the moral right to call for sacrifices from the people. All the abuses and deficiencies in

the life were attributed to the bureaucracy which was declared to be more mechanical than human. Dr. Tagore wrote "India is being ruled by a complicated machine. The mechanics who drive it have long training in power, but no tradition of human sympathy, which is superfluous in a workshop. They are incapable of understanding the living India owing to the natural mentality of the bureaucracy which implies its task and manages an alien race from a distance through various switches and handles, and wheels and hardly ever through human touch." That the problems of the masses had to be tackled was getting abundantly clear. In the twentieth century a government by fiat, however benevolent the fiat, had become an anachronism.

If in the nineteenth century the sub-continent was supposed to be living in an age of tutelage, in the twentieth century it began to show signs of maturity. The country began to be not only self-conscious, but East-conscious and world-conscious. The people had begun to look the world in the face. Increasing numbers of people emigrated to different parts of the world. The War provided further opportunities of world-contact and the soldiers brought back many experiences of life in other countries. The difficulties which emigrants had to face in other countries, and the hardships and insults they had to bear made them conscious of their

subjection. The movements of nationalism and independence all over the world interested them immensely. They showed unusual interest in internal and foreign politics. The sub-continent seemed to be finding itself embroiled in every movement, and interested in every activity in the world.

The systematic policy of England in its relations with the people of the East has been without parallel in world annals, and it remains a sure method to estimate the influence of the West on Eastern countries. England was known to be at its best in the sub-continent in its colonial administration, and the sub-continent was the biggest country in the world labouring under subjection. When the movement for national independence began the entire East showed signs of unrest and effervescence. It was fully recognised that the necessary consequences of the independence of the sub-continent would be the beginning of the freedom of the whole East. The people of the East had become increasingly impatient to bear the burden of the West; and they were no longer ready to remain a trust in European hands. With the advance of European ideas they began to resist Europe by its own methods. When the colonial administration of imperial countries showed resistance to the nationalist movement, and tried to put down by force the movements of liberation, the necessary consequence was that all such movements went

underground to prepare dynamite to explode the imperial edifices. The East became conscious of its exploitation. The sub-continent epitomizing the East, learnt great lessons from England; and it was confident that some-day England was bound to prove herself great and noble as it had always imagined her to be.

The sub-continent during this period became conscious of the rival imperialisms of Europe. The European countries on their part took increasing interest in the subject country in order to blow up the British Empire from within. All kinds of propaganda was carried out to make the East conscious of its subjection; to make the sub-continent particularly ashamed of its slavery. The countries which had the biggest part to play in the creation of anti-British feeling in the country were the Germany of the Kaiser, the Russia of the Tsars and later of the Bolsheviks, and the Japan of the Mikado. If there was any single event which gave confidence to the East as a whole it was the victory of Japan over Russia in 1905; and Lord Curzon truly declared that: "The defeat of Russia reverberated through the whispering galleries of the East." The people of the East realized what they could achieve. A young Eastern country had defeated the biggest imperial European power at its own game. Commenting on what had happened C. F. Andrews wrote: "Behind these dreams and visions was the

exulting hope that the days of servitude to the West were over and the day of independence had dawned. Much had gone before to prepare the way for such a dawn of hope which the Japanese victories made, for the first time, shining and radiant."[1] The result of the Russo-Japanese conflict combined with the Russian Revolution of 1917 played the same part among the people of the East as the French Revolution had played in Europe. Suspicion and racial hatred between the East and the West grew and the portents were visible heralding the beginning of the end of Western imperialism. It needed a great war to make Europe realize its moral degeneration and be convinced of its fall.

When the war broke out in September, 1914, the Imperial legislature at Delhi expressed a wish for the people to share "the heavy financial burden now imposed by war on the United Kindom"; and on the termination of hostilities the country's contribution to the war effort exceeded £ 226,000,000. The sub-continent as a whole went all out in war. All political agitation subsided, and all the national leaders went round in the country advocating recruitment in the armed forces. Even the extremists and the revolutionaries supported Britain in War. Mr. Asquith was able to declare: "We welcome with appreciation and affection their profferred aid and in an empire which knows no distinction of race

1. "Renaissance in India."

or class, we all alike are subjects of King Emperor and are joint and equal custodians of our common interest and fortunes". The British empire stood the shock of war. The prophecy of Bernhardi that: "The first shot fired in European war would be the signal for the dissolution of Britain's loosely compacted empire" did not come true. But all the same the massive and top-heavy structure of British administration in the country was badly shaken. The sub-continent had made tremendous sacrifices in the war. Soldiers from the country were buried in unknown graves and their bodies were exposed to all the climates of the world. There was no skirmish however insignificant and no battle however decisive in which the country's soldiers did not take part, and make sacrifice of life. The efforts and sacrifices of the people in general and the soldiers in particular, proved that the country still had faith left in England. They proved that the country respected England for the ideals for which it stood; but they expected a generous spirit on the part of the British government too. For all practical purposes peace prevailed up to 1919, when it was broken by the proclamation of Martial Law in that year. This event marked the end of one phase and the beginning of another in the history of the miserable country.

Before the end of the war the people entertained hopes, and demands were-put forth for the introduction of popular institu-

tion in the country. It was suggested that the sub-continent must evolve something of its own, in consonance with its indigenous traditions, and that only such institutions as had popular support would work for the people's happiness. No extravagant doctrinaire attempts at unimaginative imitation of English political institutions would carry the country far to success. But it seemed that all the appeals of the people fell on deaf ears and they were disappointed in their hopes. The response of the British administration to the country's sacrifices in war was the Act of 1919 and the tragedy of Amritsar. This tragedy meant the end of the period of peace; and after it, began the life of ceaseless agitation, restlessness and uncertainty.

The official report to Parliament declared that: "This tragedy left fatal legacies— embittered racial feelings, wounded national pride, which in conjunction with economic stress and post-war uneasiness darkened the political firmament of India". The significance of this episode was fully brought forth by the Duke of Connaught who when inaugurating the new constitution in 1921 declared, "Gentlemen, I have finished my part in today's official proceedings. May I claim your patience and forbearance while I say a few words of a personal nature? Since I landed I have felt around me bitterness and estrangement between those who have oeen, and should be friends. The shadow of Amritsar has

lengthened over the fair face of India. I know how deep is the concern felt by His Majesty, the King Emperor at the terrible chapter of events in the Punjab. No one can deplore these events more intensely than I do myself. I have reached a time of life when I most desire to heal wounds and to re-unite those who have been disunited. In what must be, I fear, my last visit to the India I love so well, here in the new capital inaugurating a new constitution, I am moved to make you a personal appeal, but in the simple words that come from my heart, not be coldly and critically interpreted. My experience tells me that misunderstandings usually mean mistakes on either side. As an old friend of India, I appeal to you all, British and Indians to bury along with the dead past the mistakes and misunderstandings of the past, to forgive where you have to forgive, and to join hands and to work together to realise the hopes that rise from to-day". The grand old duke had uttered certain soothing words, but their effect was lost on both sides—the country began to live the days of unhappiness over again.

The sub-continent now stood on the threshold of a new era of vast all around changes which followed in breath-taking succession. The resurgence of the nationalist movement created a revulsion against any indiscriminate imitation of the West. The indigenous mind was unhinged and unbal-

anced through the effects of various external theories, and extreme internal sufferings. The sub-continent once again became a precarious possession of Britain, like it was before the Mutiny. Now also began a searching of hearts and facing of facts. Great philosophers like Dr. Tagore advised the nationalist that: 'It is only by knowing the Europe that is great and good that we can effectively guard ourselves, against the Europe that is base and greedy". In England too a searching of hearts began. Many Englishmen began to realize, slowly but surely, that to leave the bureaucracy in the sub-continent uncontrolled and unbridled would mean to let free "hot-heads who would like to govern India—and England too—with the lash and the terror of the machine-gun and the hangman".[1] They realized that the bureaucracy was bringing untold misery, to their own country and to the world and it must be checked. When, after the war things began to go from bad to worse, in England too the eyes of the people were opened. They realized that the pre-war ideas would bring nothing but disasters for England both at home and abroad. Many Englishmen undertook the courageous task of telling the truth to their own countrymen. "The English were at last going to give up being hypocrites, they were instead—modern wars being very ghastly—going to be merely open and confessed mischief-makers and

1. Osburn "Must England lose India."

rascals"[1]. England soon began to realize that, "it was no use being strong and rich if you dare not be honest". Of course many tragedies had to take place before the final stage of understanding and reconciliation was to be reached. England began to teach the sub-continent how to secure freedom from a dominant power; and the country began to teach England a different method of conceding one—the sub-continent had to earn its liberation.

1. Osburn "Must England lose India.

. 5 .

THE INEVITABLE STRUGGLE

The war ended but the problem of the sub-continent not only remained unsolved, but grew more and more complicated and embarrassing. All the issues which looked shapeless before, began to take shape. All tones which were subdued, became loud and resonant. English education and English institutions began to bear their natural fruit. The entire life passed through the pangs of both the evolutionary and the revolutionary processes. Political restlessness, mental agitation, and reckless methods of action became noticeable, both in the government and the people. Thus begins the period which can well be described as that of racial prejudice, ignorance, misunderstanding, of suspicion and doubt, of narrowness of outlook and indifference to the people's aspirations, of apathy and lack of governance; it became a period of alarms, conjectures, feelers and schemes, of attempted reproachments and repeated failures and disappointments. Finally this period emerged as a period of natural political differences and unnatural

social and intellectual growth, of greater impatience and lesser sobriety.

Certain truths began to dawn on the indigenous mind. They were "now convinced, without any mental wavering or hesitation that unless complete independence, moral as well as political, is open for India to grasp with both hands, she will never shake herself free from the subservience which has enervated her. The vicious circle wherein she has become involved, cannot otherwise be broken through". It became clear to the people that national progress cannot be compartmented at will, without serious dangers to the entire body politic; that literature and art, politeness and refinement had the greatest scope to thrive among the nations which were independent and free whereas the artificial life of slavery increasingly reduced all chances of a sound moral life; that advancement of science and military skill, the soundness of civil administration and national morale could not be achieved without a free national existence; that self-respect and self-control could only be cultivated under self-government; that the progress of a nation depended upon the cultivation of every branch of national life along all lines at the same time; and above all it was clear to them in the words of Disraeli that a "political institution is a machine, the motive power is the national character. With that it rests whether the machine will benefit society or destroy it".

The country was now agitated not by one kind of nationalism but two; and in this gigantic struggle for communal and religious self-assertion the entire life looked bleak and barren. Right upto the war the Congress remained in the hands of the moderates like Gokhale (died in 1915); but after the war a new and younger generation arose which turned away from those leaders and doctrines, and actually attacked the positions they defended. The youth of the country became increasingly bitter against both the British, and the older generation of the moderate leaders. They began to view not only with disfavour, but abhorrence those among them who collaborated with foreign rulers. They studied various wars of liberation in America, in Italy, in Ireland, they studied the biographies of Washington, Parnell, Garibaldi, Lenin and others which inspired them with new hopes and gave them new courage. Thus commenced the period of romantic nationalism in the sub-continent (romantic imperialism having completely fallen down) of which the students steeped in English ideas and English thought through their knowledge of the English tongue, were the very heart and soul. The Earl of Ronaldshay, explained the entire situation by writing that "the question is really one in which sentiment plays a prominent part. India has reached a stage in political growth when, having acquired a share in the control of the government of the country, she is thrusting out her hands to grasp the whole.

While the dangers of too precipitate a leap from the stage of partial to that of complete indigenous control are staringly apparent to all who are familiar with conditions prevailing in India, no surprise need be felt at the sensitiveness of the intelligentsia of the country in the matter of foreign—which in this case means British—interference. India's awakened national consciousness insists that acquiescence on the part of her public men, in the continued exercise of control by men of another race, whether in the sphere of administration or in any other field, is tantamount to an admission of their own inferiority. Need it, then, cause us surprise if such acquiescence is, for the most part, not forthcoming? Or that where it is, it is but grudgingly given?".[1]

This romantic nationalism was inspired by certain leaders who made the youth look upto the country's past and take interest and pride in its civilization. They were exhorted to discard Western shallowness and Western materialism; so the youth began to look with abomination upon all Western modes of life. They conceived of Western industrialism, Western imperialism and Western education as one, the cumulative effect of which was total and thorough enslavement of the body and the soul. By a logical and systematic form of reasoning they arrived at the unescapable conclusion that the first cause of their troubles

1. "India—a Bird's Eye View."

and miseries was their subjection to a foreign rule. Thus it became fashionable to attack everything British. Many aspects of the British rule which in cooler moments of thought would be favourably evaluated and estimated were deliberately and vehemently thrashed. No credit was given to Britain for what it had done and achieved in the sub-continent—the resurgent patriotism declared all such talk blasphemous. They began to suggest that the biggest injuries inflicted upon the people and their country have had the outward appearance of blessings. English education chiefly, it was said, had destroyed in the educated, the love of their own literature, the quickening soul of the people and their delight in their own arts, and the worst of all their repose in their traditional institutions—national and religious. English education was said to have paralysed the living moral forces of the people by relieving them of all sense of responsibility and self-confidence. They declared, that every British institution in the country was meant to destroy the capacity of the people to appreciate their own institutions. It was suggested that it was the fault of Britain that the country stood so poor, so weak, so vulnerable and so despised in the world. Everything English became an anathema. It was suggested that the sub-continent had a glorious millennium before the British came and now "what remains is the dream of former happiness and the langour and misery

of insistent pain." British rule, British commercial methods, and industrial policies had bled the country white. The country could have advanced with just the same pace or even with an accelerated pace without British aid. But interestingly enough even during this time when the nationalist forces were trying every method to dissociate the people from English education and English institutions, simultaneously the process of assimilation of English ideas continued unchecked, perhaps with increasing vigour. Thus nationalism and social life became confused, inconsistent, eclectic and out-of-joint. The misguided efforts to eradicate all kinds of English influences could not prove successful, but they were effective enough to make life still more superficial and artificial. Indeed mischief to the old order was done long before, and it was fast crumbling now,—it was gone, it could never step in again,—but alas the new one had no smooth way to be born.

Political awakening was accompanied by a new attitude towards the West and its problems. Western materialism and Western industrialism were condemned due to spiritual degeneration and physical misery they produced. Mr. C. R. Das, one of the foremost leaders of the time declared; "This one thing we must remember for ever, that this industrialism never was and never will be art and part of our nature....if we seek to

establish industrialism in our land, we shall be laying down with our own hands the road to our destruction. Mills and factories—like some gigantic monsters—will crush out the little life that still feebly pulsates in our veins, and we shall whirl round with their huge wheels and be like some dead soulless machines ourselves."

In the Great War, though it was essentially a conflict between the nations of the West, yet for the first time the people of the East played an active and real part in bringing an end to it, the way it did, and thereby contributed to deciding the destiny of Europe. The war made the people think about themselves in the world context; and the change that occurred was described by Prof. Rushbrook Williams by writing, "prior to the outbreak of that struggle the aspirations of many educated Indians had been confined to securing the modification of certain specific features of the administrative machinery which did not meet with their approval. But as a result of the moral effect upon imperial opinion of India's contribution to the victory, and secondly of the immense stimulus of democratic ideas resulting from the course of the conflict, the national movement in India assumed a form at once more definite and more far-reaching than it had previously known."

The people of the East realised to their chagrin and anger that when a European or a

Christian fought for his country or his religion he was a hero to be praised and remembered; whereas when an oriental or a heathen fought for the same reason so very dear to him, he was dubbed a fanatic. When the white races hated those with skin of a different colour and refused to mix with them socially and politically on equality they were justified, whereas when a coloured man endeavoured to do just the same to safeguard his very existence and subsistence, he was stigmatized as backward, barbaric and uncivilized. Thus arose the consciousness that the white man's burden willingly shouldered, of imparting to the people of coloured races the blessings of Western civilization, meant in fact the burden unwillingly carried by the coloured races to provide Europe with objects of exploitation for its own profit. This attitude of mind was further quickened by the frequent unscrupulousness and shameless ways in which European powers behaved where their trade and financial interests were involved. To the people of the East all European ethics—social and political—appeared riddled with hypocrisy and lies. All the grandiloquent pronouncements seemed at bottom only a cloak for the designs to exploit their commercial dominance. White states inhabited by the white races—nay even by coloured races themselves—refused the rights of emigration and other elementary civic rights to the people of Asia and even original inhabitants who had no other object

in settlement and life but to enjoy the normal rights of citizenship, whereas the Europeans carried on active missionary work in the Eastern countries and sent military expeditions to protect European nationals in Eastern countries against imaginary dangers. There was at once created what Townsend called "the charm of Asia for Asiatics" which never existed before. In the development of this Eastern consciousness the sub-continent took an active part. It created and inspired a sentiment of common fellowship and belief in a common destiny of the subject peoples of the East. Even as a subject country the sub-continent began to lead the other countries.

The trepidations of the ruling powers were understandable. They gave promises which were never meant to be fulfilled, and thereby created a general groan, discontent, bitterness and distrust in the entire East. On looking around, observers like Prof. Rushbrook Williams wrote: "Those who pride themselves upon accurate perception of the future course of world politics, are beginning to envisage a struggle, which shall be waged not between rival exponents of Western culture, but between whole races of mankind; and, in fact one can no longer deny that one of the gravest perils menacing humanity in the near future is the conflict between men of different colours. Now the possibility of averting such a calamity is plainly increased

if India, can be retained within the boundaries of the British Commonwealth of her own free-will."

It had become increasingly clear that England was the champion of the white races of the West, and the sub-continent was the champion of the coloured races of the East. It became increasingly clear too that but for England's support all the European empires in the East would tumble down and would fall like houses of cards. Even a German Professor declared in 1911, "I should like to refute the idea that it would be advantageous to us Germans if English sovereignty collapsed in India.—I believe that the very opposite is true. Ever since Japan's victory over Russia and the consequent awakening of the East, we have been aware of a positive answer to the great question, whether the white race and white culture are finally to dominate the earth is no wise so assured as we formerly believed; on the contrary we still have the really decisive struggle before us.... Now it is in India, of all the places on the earth, that the superiority of the white race over the coloured is most strikingly demonstrated. If the Asiatics were to succeed in destroying English mastery there, then the position of the whole white race throughout the world would be fatally undermined. We too, should suffer." These were strange revelations and amusing and inspiring confessions. It was getting increasingly clear that an

independent sub-continent would be the motive force for the federation of West Asia and South East Asia. Certainly it was because the sub-continent was a subject country that it would inspire sympathy in other Eastern countries. Not only was "the superiority of the white race over the coloured most strikingly demonstrated," but it was there that England, as a Western country, had been fundamentally instrumental in the creation of political consciousness. England as a successful imperial country could still show courage to shake off what other European countries could not.

Thus, simultaneously with the expansion of England, the sub-continent acquired a new position and status in Asia. If England was the representative of the West and all that it meant, and all other European empires stood propped up due to its support, the sub-continent was beginning to be a real representative of the East and what it meant, by inspiring the peoples of the East with a new mission. If England led Europe—rather at great discomfort, risk, expense and loss—in taking pride in the superiority of the white races, the sub-continent was creating a new consciousness among the peoples of the East to be proud of their heritage. There were many factors which contributed to the leadership of the sub-continent in the East, and we cannot deny that England played a predominant part in indirectly securing it. Japan

was bound to go under. It had mastered only the destructive side of European civilization. There was no depth in Japanese ideals. It maintained grabbing characteristics. Japan was spectacular and brilliant but not profound and serious. The sub-continent had suffered to learn, and it learnt great lessons after great sacrifices. The peoples of the East conceded leadership to it ungrudgingly. The country as such had not made enemies in the world; and sympathy for its peoples' aspirations was universal. Having been conceded this leadership, without actually claiming it, it began to assume leadership; and all the peoples of the East were not reluctant to follow it. The sub-continent was the representative of the subject races, a friend in suffering and they looked upon it as the leader of their liberation; nay, it was as if their freedom hung on the freedom of the sub-continent. The fall of Japan, which was inevitable in the very nature of the case, gave it undisputed moral leadership. But after the war there were two Indias looking out in two opposite directions. The Muslim India looking to the West and the Hindu India looking to the East. Both had grown up under English influences; having grown to maturity, they claimed separate existence. The result of the Great War II was that they boldly asserted what before it, they put forth in subdued tones.

After the war the English and the Russian influences worked more or less simultaneously in the East. The entire attitude of the British changed in view of the Russian interest in the East. Russia seemed to proclaim to the world that "the authority of the state emanates from the people." The Russian revolutionaries knew that their hardest blows must be aimed at British capitalism and British imperialism; and it was in the sub-continent that they were in full grandeur and force. They directed their efforts on it to put it on conflagration. Communist parties were established and they began their activities of agitation and intrigue. For various reasons the Muslims became special objects of interest in the East both initially for Russia and later for Japan. The Muslims had solidly stood behind Britain in war without caring for the pan-Islamic sentiments which after the war seemed to be active again. Prof. Rushbrook Williams tells us that in every way: "The revolutionary government of Soviet Russia with its avowed aim to setting East ablaze, has for the last four years done its best to exploit for its own ends the Islamic sentiment." Thus the fear of the spread of the Russian revolutionary propaganda in the country became the biggest concern of the British administration. One has only to look at the proscribed literature of the period, and be fully convinced of this panic in the British imperial mind.

In the nineteenth century Russia was simply an external military danger to the British supremacy in the country, but after the war it became much more insidious and formidable, being a danger of an ideological character. Thus was opened a new chapter in the country's history. The sub-continent more than any other country in the East was fit to receive and make use of the new instruments and methods of attack provided by Russia. Russia began to approach the entire East through the sub-continent as if through the stomach. The country began to violently react against British supremacy. The entire national movement took a new turn and became pugnacious, violent and terroristic. The ideas of revolution and national independence joined to give momentum to all the activities peaceful and anarchic—Revolutionary nationalism in the country assumed the Russian revolution as a model for itself. The British bureaucracy was given the appellation of "Tsarist bureaucracy". It was proclaimed that the twentieth century began with two despots in the world—the Tsar had disappeared, but the Viceroy remained. The factors which facilitated the infiltration of Russian communistic ideas were that Russia had certain intimate affinities with the peoples of the East due to reasons geographical and cultural. The Russian revolution further demonstrated that a proletarian revolution or a socialist revolution was possible not only in an industrialized country and in a country

with a predominant urban population but in an agricultural country too—and the sub-continent was essentially an agricultural country like Russia. The Russian revolution further proved that a people's revolution was possible even in an autocratic regime, backed by an unfeeling bureaucracy and a strong military power. It further proved that a disarmed people need not necessarily be a weak people. In short the Russian revolution facilitated matters for the country to take courage and achieve independence, by following the Russian revolutionary methods. Certainly in the sub-continent matters and issues were reaching a climax.

Soon, there was noticeable the interesting spectacle that there was not a social or political ideology in the world which was not represented in the sub-continent in one form or the other. Along with anti-deluvianism, philosophical anarchism, revolutionary communism, socialism, capitalism, ultra-modernism, and their various Right and Left ramifications and extensions; we found monarchomacs, extreme autocrats, and conservatives of the most die-hard type. As the war came to an end and the twentieth century advanced the principal change, that occurred in the psychological attitude of the people, was the new and overwhelming interest they showed in politics. Before the war, politics was confined to a certain class of people and to certain professions; but with the pass-

age of time political activity which had localized itself at the apex began to gravitate to the base and spread among the masses. Marxism began to influence the youth —of course Hindu youth more than Muslim youth. The result was that every student organization in the country showed a strong tendency to be a communist strong-hold. Taking note of what had happened, Sir Henry Harrison warned the government: "In dealing with young India, therefore, as it is sometimes called, it is the gravest mistake to suppose that we are politically (as we are obviously militarily) dealing with an insignificant section of the community; the sentiments which are now fermenting in the minds of two hundred thousand persons will flow out, nay, are flowing out, into the hearts of two hundred millions. The gravest blunder which can possibly be made is to suppose that the effect of our dealings with the educated natives can be made to begin and end with that class."

These tendencies of the time gave rise to two typical characters of the modern age—the professional politician and the political agitator. In the sub-continent it was not rarely that we found both these characters combined into one. The art of agitation was introduced with all its subtle Western machinery and ingenuity. Monster meetings, long petitions and market platforms became institutions. The demagogue and the political mountebank became typical products of the

social and political currents and undercurrents. Posters, pamphlets and mobile-loud speakers became handy means of propaganda to scatter venom in the country. Politics and agitation became wholetime jobs, though there were plenty of people whose interest in them was of the nature of a pleasure pastime. These were professions on the whole rather paying too—in which the problems of 'unemployment' and 'no-vacancy' did not arise. Politics created a psychological love for adventure and excitement in a life of utter vegetation and hopelessness. Political agitation provided the satisfaction of comparative freedom. Thus the politician, the agitator and the student began to move together and their activities were bound to leave indelible marks on the face of the country and on its history.

In the nineteenth century the forces of communal disharmony and disuuity wcre either dormant, or underground and invisible or stoop suppressed due to political reasons or subdued due to the political gloom, but they were never eradicated. Actually during the preceding period thcy were taking deeper roots surreptitiously and unnoticed. The introduction of Parliamentary institutions made their growth luxuriant. For all practical purpose initially there was no danger seen aad no one could foresee the future problems that would be created. The second quarter of the twentieth century fully de-

monstrated, that no political parties or sections of the population, had an unqualified acceptance or an unmixed reception for all the institutions introduced by the British. There was a visible frantic race to acquire power either by hook or by crook; and the Montagu-Chelmsford report said that: "So long as the two communities maintain any thing like their present views as to the separateness of their interests, we are bound to regard religious hostilities as still a very serious possibility." Alliances, compromises and understandings were possible among the communities so long as they were expedient and convenient. It was the immediate advantage offered by the political institutions which prompted all the parties to vie with one another in snatching it. All the principles, and ideas crystallised and all the sections and factions took shape when the twentieth century advanced. Many diseases and disintegrating tendencies which could have remained latent became patent. Though there was no active or passive support of the ruling power in the creation of these differences, yet all the problems resulted due to its mere existence. All these differences needed the external authority of a third and neutral power to burgeon and play their part. It seemed that the country with all its ostensible material advancement and exuberant national resurgence was showing signs of disruption, and anarchy of the eighteenth century.

Sir Auckland Colvin analysing the position and forecasting consequences wrote: "To the superficial observer the disorders of 1857 may seem impossible of recurrence. Everywhere the eye rests now upon railways, telegraphs, schools, municipalities, district boards, newspapers, English education. It is what the eye does not rest upon, however, which in all organism is vital. Fanaticism bigotry, poverty in high places, the pride of ancestry, pretensions of caste, lust for adventure, that Bacchic fury which blazes out so unaccountably in the East, slumber lightly beneath the sprinkling of Western soil. To these, British rule has added new elements of complication, fresh groupings of bodies, more active inter-change of native opinion, wider combinations, the growing knowledge, the germs of strange hopes." A missionary Commission on "Christian Higher Education in India" declared in its report: "Religion has become the centre, round which their conflicts gather—religion represented by an idol of Ganpati or a cow led to sacrifice or music played by Hindu processions as they pass a mosque. These have become incentives and stimuli to antagonism, and old dying religious passions have flamed up again, all over the country. At the same time it is probably true that a deeper and worthier nationalist spirit sometimes creates the desire to be one with the common people, and may even send educated men back to the old idolatries and the old animisms in the

hope by these means to restore the sundered ties that education has severed, and that the new feeling of kinship longs to knit up again into national unity. What is unreal and what is real in this patriotic orthodoxy, can be fully revealed when the hostilities that have stimulated nationalism to take these shapes have passed away and more natural religious relations are restored." It seemed that the people were getting increasingly mad and that the country as a whole was presenting an impression of an unmanageable lunatic asylum. "A declared policy of racial disability and racial segregation, in addition to the threatening large and well-established vested interests bitterly outraged Indian national sentiment" was the information conveyed to Parliament in 1921. "This India was almost strange compared to the old. Nothing less than an inner revolution has occurred;" this was the opinion of C. F. Andrews, who seriously studied all that was happening in the country. And an Englishman wrote "I am deeply impressed by the sincerity of the Indian leaders; and I am afraid people at home do not realize how strong the feeling is—there is absolutely no antagonism to the English as such....I never realized that the Indians were capable of such an effort. Men are not only cheerfully going to prison but are cheerfully allowing their lands to be confiscated in return for non-payment of taxes. When a country's spirit is like that, how can any real Englishman help....but respect a

people who are by nature pacific and non-violent."[1]

The sub-continent began to get disillusioned in many ways. It was found out that the policy of the government in spite of the reforms of 1919, and the country's sacrifices in war, was still to maintain the status quo, and all the measures were directed by the command: "As you were." A Missionary Commission declared in 1931: "The Mutiny thus had certain important results, in as much as in state policy from then onwards considerations of security became a primary, if not determining, concern. The former political liberalism of the administration tended to disappear almost completely, and while reforms, such as Lord Ripon's scheme of local self-government were accepted, they were rendered more or less innocuous by the safeguards imposed on their working." It was found that in years before the war any swing of the pendulum in English political life unavoidably and invariably produced a corresponding swing in the sub-continent in a certain direction depending upon the ideologies of the party in power, but in years after the war the country became disillusioned when labour governments too, permitted or acquiesced in all the traditional illegalities and practices of the government. It had come to pass that the subject country now made no distinction between liberal, con-

1. "India and Simon Report."

servative and labour ideas and policies, with regard to its problems. The country had stood by Britain at very great sacrifices because it respected Britain for the ideals for which it fought the war: but soon after the war it got disillusioned when it watched, and seriously watched in dismay the game of power politics that was being played in international politics. It was disillusioned to find that the moral principles for which the war was fought, were being so quickly and unscrupulously surrendered by the great powers—and among them by England too.

The country's disillusionment was complete, in men, in parties, in institutions and in ideals. Its people would have nothing to do with Europe. They interpreted nationalism in their traditional terms. They ridiculed the ideas of training for self-government. They became impatient to achieve national freedom at once without waiting for it as something still to come. Sir Surrendranath Banerjee wrote : "The point of difference between us and the government is that it is not moving fast enough to meet the progressive requirements of the country or the growing aspirations of the people." Their attitude was stiffened and their activities were quickened by the national resurgence in countries all around. Any steps for constitutional development to end in due course into full freedom were no longer acceptable to them. They dubbed these pronounce-

ments as attempts by Britain to hold the country in perpetual grip by constitutional niceties. They began to assert, that Britain had withheld from them the paradise that the country would have been without the British control; and that any condition of civil war, disorder or anarchy was preferable to the continued existence of British rule. Consequently they condemned everything English. Even the English language, which had given them capacity and inspired them with confidence and courage to struggle for independence, which they employed to attack the British administration and British institutions and to gain world sympathy in these causes, and above all which had facilitated matters for them to intelligibly and poignantly abuse and condemn each other in the choicest of English words, they attacked as an instrument through the agency of which their past history and classical knowledge was kept away from them; and that through it they were taught to hate themselves and their institutions, more than to have confidence in themselves and live their natural life.

Perhaps the most astonishing phenomenon and the outstanding feature of the post-war sub-continent was the renaissance and the bursting forth of the Muslims on the country's scene. The latent vitality and vigour of the Muslim community became elemental in its resurgence. The Muslims were stirred by recent events both in and out-

side the Country. They had solidly stood behind Britain in the war and had emerged as the strongest supporters of British bureaucracy. Though they did derive certain advantages from this close association in the constitutional framework and in the administration, yet it became increasingly clear to them that by their association with Britain the Muslims outside the sub-continent looked upon them with suspicion. The Hijrat of 1920 convinced them that they must aspire for a separate national existence, and then alone they would be able to secure their proper place in the Muslim countries of the world.

There is a note of warning which must be sounded. There are a few points which the readers must bear in mind the overlooking of which has produced a great deal of misinterpretation, misconstruction and misunderstanding in the past. The East as such has been very wrongly interpreted and explained in a great majority of European writings because it has been wrongly understood by the writers themselves due to racial, linguistic and psychological differences. 'The East' and the 'Orient' have always exercised a mesmeric and romantic influence on European writers, and in their enthusiasm to explore the treasures of the East, and convey fairy tale information to the European public they hardly showed any regard to facts. It must be borne in mind that the East

is not one East as the West could be called the Christian West—even though the latter may not be in fact, it is so at least in name. The East in fact is the Muslim East, the Hindu East, the Budhhist East. The 'East' as such is a common factor present in them all; that it does exist is true, but how small and misleading it has been, is not commonly realized. The words 'Oriental' and the 'Eastern' can be faithfully applied only in those cases wherein the East as such presents a political problem to itself or has presented itself as a common political problem to the European empires in the East.

In the same way the word 'Indian' has been wrongly used in many Western writings. The tendency of the past fifty years or so has been that the Hindus have increasingly used the word Indian as synonymous with Hindu, and have generally excluded the Muslims from its purview and scope. Most of the European writers too, generally being more acquainted with the Hindu writings, became victims of this contagion and only rarely did they emphasise the separateness of Muslims from general 'Indian' discussion. The Muslims on their part, since the Khilafat movement, tried in every way to distinguish themselves from "Indians" in general by calling themselves the "Indian Muslims". This is a mistake commonly committed by European writers both with regard to the interpretation of the word "East" and 'India'. It is neces-

sary tc warn the reader and emphasise this distinito on, the understanding of which alone will facilitate the discussion of various oriental or 'Indian' problems. The 'Indian Muslim,' was an Indian, a Muslim and an oriental partially displaying the characters of each but in no way synonymous with 'Indian' and 'Oriental' as such.

Thus had come a time when the Muslims of the sub-continent too, like the Muslims all over the world, began to step out from their imaginary strongholds of security into the prosaic domain of reality. They had in a way destroyed the Islamic world loyalty, and they must pay for the wrong before they could advance. They were fifty years behind the Hindus and they made proportionate efforts to keep pace with them. They realized that they could not play the part assigned to them by the Hindus, without seriously and perhaps irretrievably jeopardizing their very existence in the country. The failure of the Khilafat movement shattered their last attempts to collaborate with the Hindus for Hindu-Muslim unity. The parting of ways between the two communities was complete. The Muslims finally got convinced that they had much more to gain by standing alone, than by adhering to the tempting and infructuous schemes of the Hindus and Mr. Gandhi.

This consciousness among the Muslims took a vigorous turn through the efforts of

Moulana Mohammad Ali, Dr. Muhammad Iqbal and Mr. M. A. Jinnah. They realized the dangers in which they might land themselves if they drifted with the general current. They realized that a nation which lived under foreign domination, lost all vitality and power for spontaneous growth. It lived a false life at all moments. There could be no harmony between its body and soul and the process would necessarily end in the death of the soul. Their position as a mere community in a united country permanently dominated by a Hindu majority would be worse than that under the British rule—the British were at least afraid of the loss of their empire, the Hindus would have no such fear, under these circumstances it might not be possible for them to contribute anything of their own to their Islamic life. The close cooperation between the two communities became increasingly difficult—well-nigh impossible. Their very civilizations stood diametrically opposed to each other. In ideas of life and death, in conceptions legal and philosophical, in attitude to social and individual problems, in vogues of dress and in manners they stood poles apart. The levelling religion of Islam was abhorrent to Hinduism which stood against all expurgation of caste. Muslim iconoclasticism could never work in harmony with the idolatrous nature of Hindu worship. Muslim robustness could never work in consonance and peace with Hindu renunciation. It is an accepted

maxim of human society that lack of religious, cultural and social homogeneity always hinders solidarity and unity. The result of these heterogeneous conditions in the country, was that not only cooperative working in life was difficult but they definitely worked for segregation and compartmentalization in population. Constitutional development during British rule does provide certain instances when reproachments were made and efforts for collaboration were vigorously undertaken, but all these attempts simply proved the futility of embarking on them. Dr. Bannerth was perfectly right when he wrote: "Racially and linguistically they are Indians, but this does not preclude them from stressing that 'My nation is Musalman'."

"Anarchy in Central Asia; the advancing tide of Bolshevik aggression; deeply agitated Islamic sentiment; a distracted border —such were the anxieties which beset the statesmen throughout the year 1921" and such was the summing up of the Official report in 1921. It became increasingly clear that events taking place outside the country militated against any prolonged and deeper Anglo-Muslim collaboration, and any efforts for Hindu-Muslim unity; whereas these events increasingly attracted the Muslims to countries outside. In this Muslim regeneration Pan-Islamism played a very great part. British connection, direct or indirect, with all the

Muslim countries facilitated intercourse, but strained relations between them and Britain. British apathy to the Muslim countries left them rather bitter. The Muslims had stood by the British in war and there was the Treaty of Sevres imposed on Turkey. A new urge was felt to strengthen the weakened ties among the Muslim countries. The ideals of spiritual unity and common sympathy for their Muslim brothers in faith, inspired the Muslims with ideas of a distinct nationality.

The war had given rise to certain international tendencies. The most important was the new consciousness among the nations that the higher the development of modern civilization and more complex the state machinery in a country, the more the smaller groups were in danger of extinction. The people began to realize that the accumulation of political authority in the central state organisation was becoming unavoidable under post-war conditions. They also realized that assimilation and incorporation of heterogeneous elements in the population of a country on mere sentimental grounds, regardless of the actualities of life always proved a constant source not only of internal troubles, but also an excuse for external interference. These centrifugal and centripetal forces in international life had proved a constant source of conflict in all the countries of the world; and it was as much true of the sub-continent as of any other country. The Muslims of

the sub-continent realized that the differences between them and the Hindus were fundamental and irreconcilable; and it would be in the interest of both to part.

In the post-war years the Muslims further saw a mission in their life which they could never carry through in case of a united independent sub-continent. The great war had left the entire Muslim world in chaos and had infused a new spirit among them. They were no longer haunted by the fear of being a minority; nor did they look for their sentimental satisfaction to any Muslim country outside. The Muslims had come to look upon themselves as the true representatives of the Islamic spirit. They found that they constituted the biggest and the strongest unit of the Muslim world. They began to look upon the sub-continent not only as a hope of their strong national existence, but also as a centre that would raise the Muslim countries in the world and unite them in a common mission to achieve the glories of their past civilization. The Muslims of the sub-continent were inspired by world Muslim brotherhood. For them to be merged in a unitary form of government in the country would mean extinction of all their hopes. Their refusal to be treated as a minority dependent on the mercy of a permanent Hindu majority, found expression in the demand for a separate homeland for themselves. Even a federation or any other composite form of government

in which they would play a subordinate part could not be acceptable to them. Dr. Iqbal declared that "the problem of India is international and not national " and the Muslims took note of it. The events of the second quarter of the twentieth century necessitated recognition of the imperative need for seriously tackling this problem before the country could advance on the path of peace and prosperity.

After the war the fear of Hindu domination as a result of the working of parliamentary representative institutions increased among the Muslims, and so a new positive idea began to take shape in their minds; the Muslims were no longer a community within one nation but they were a separate nation by themselves. Mr. Jinnah declared that: "A democratic system of parliamentary government based on concepts of homogeneous nation and the method of counting heads was impossible in India." The Muslim population of one hundred million souls in the country and their predominant majority in five out of the eleven British Provinces entitled them to a separate national status. Nations were entitled to stand on equal footing with one another in the international family of nations, and had every Right to self-determination and claims to separate existence. The sub-continent was no more a nation than Europe was a nation. Dr. Iqbal declared in 1930: "It is clear that in view of

India's infinite variety of climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems the creation of autonomous states based on unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India." Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah summed up the Muslim case by saying: "There are in India two nations who both must share the governance of their common motherland." "Indian unity is a myth" and "the present unity of India is British made and is upheld by the British bayonets and bureaucratic system of government." The idea of the Muslim nation in the country thus crystallized in the demand for Pakistan put forth by the All-India Muslim League in 1940.

The passing of this resolution by the All India Muslim League, thereby defining the Muslim attitude in concrete terms to live a separate life from the Hindus, was a memorrable event in the country's history. It showed a perfect parting of ways between the two communities. The bifurcation of the national conception was complete. Henceforth the problem of the sub-continent could only be solved on the basis of the recognition of the "Muslim India" and the "Hindu India." The conception of a "united India" was as dead as stone. The Muslims began to repeat the words of Machiaevelli to the Hindus and the British that: "It is better to follow the real truth of things than an imagi-

nary view of them; for many republics and princedoms have been imagined which were never seen or known to exist in reality." The truth and force of Muslim demand slowly convinced the Hindus too, and Mr. K. M. Pannikar wrote; "And since Islamic society, environment and attitude towards life are different from those of the Hindus, the conception of Indian Muslims as a race or a nation, though it may not be ethnically correct, is from point of view of society undoubtedly right". This was rather a slow admission of a hard fact; but it was getting increasingly clear that unless the fact was acknowledged the sub-continent would remain in the doldrums—finally it was acknowledged, and the sub-continent was no longer a slave country.

The two great men who led the Muslims in this great struggle were Maulana Mohammad Ali and Mohammad Ali Jinnah. Maulana Mohammad Ali was the first leader of the Muslim regeneration in the twentieth century. A student of Aligarh and Oxford, he was one of the founders of All-India Muslim League in 1906. He was the grandson of a person who had served the British in the Mutiny. His entire attitude to the British changed after the declaration of war. He became a close collaborator of Mr. Gandhi and an advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity. He was interned during the war, and later became the leader of Khilafat movement. He died in

London during the deliberations of the Conference, and the Muslims again went in search of a leader. He was the most pugnacious leader the Muslims produced, and was a hero of the Muslim youth. His writings and speeches to this day, remain a constant source of inspiration to the Muslims of the subcontinent.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah was an interesting personality of the sub-continent. He had a meteoric rise in public life. He went to England at the age of sixteen, after finishing his school education. He joined the Bar at Lincoln's Inn and practised in England for a number of years. Later he came to the country and proved himself one of the most successful lawyers in it. He was a possessor of many qualities. He was a first rate debator, a clever Parliamentarian, a master of the subtle skill in gibe and sarcasm, very bold in the expression of his views even to the point of bluntness and utter rudeness, very haughty and arrogant in his demeanour, a person with a keen taste for sartorial perfection, a lover of fine carpets and grandeur, a person very impatient of any criticism but with a vast amount of patience to carry through his schemes, well-known for his tenacity and a staunch believer in "stick to your guns," and above all he was "a general who had won the battle without any lieutenants." After the death of Maulana Mohammad Ali he maintained the tradition

of the great leader and from a staunch "Indian nationalist" became the leader of Muslim Nationalism. Never in history had a leader so solitary, in such a short time, with the smallest sacrifices on the part of the nation, with such sheer devotion, dexterity and subtle power of diplomacy and political manoeuvring, pulled through from the abysmal depth, a nation so disorganised, impetuous and so expert at killing leaders as the Muslims of the sub-continent. Indeed he has been well-described as, "the greatest man in Asia."

As the War (1914) approached its end it became increasingly clear that the people of the sub-continent would not quietly acquiesce in the doings of their omnipotent rulers; and after the termination of hostilities it was found that the War had left the British government and the indigenous people in different and antithetical ways of thought and action. The bureaucratic administration became very indiscreet in its measures. It concentrated all its efforts to become a grand and massive police force to maintain "law and order" for "the peace and tranquility of India". The government of the country advocated drastic measures in curbing nationalist activities, and in a resolution said "To those servants of the government who are charged with the onerous responsibility of suppressing excesses against public peace and tranquility, the Governor-General in Council extends the fullest assurance of

countenance and support".[1] Whereas this was the attitude of the administration the people neglected all the other activities of life as unimportant and concentrated their efforts upon throwing away that administration, by any means they could think of. Under these circumstances there was bound to come a clash between the ideals of the ruling power, and the aspirations of the ruled. The administration tried to maintain control in its hands whereas the people thought in terms of throwing away that control and smashing the iron and wooden bureaucracy by a revolution from within and by agitation from without. The fundamental notions of the prestige of the ruler and the self-respect of the ruled were in direct conflict. Expression to the real working of the indigenous mind was faithfully given by the Simon Commission who said: "We should say without hesittaion that the political sentiment which is most widespread among all educated Indians is the expression of a demand for equality with Europeans—the attitude the Indian takes upon a given matter is largely governed by consideration of his self-respect. It is a great deal more than a personal feeling; it is the claim of the East for due recognition of status."

Before the War there was White or European solidarity which was recognised as a matter of convention to be the foundation

1. M. O'Dwyer "India as I knew it."

of Eurpoean policy in relation to the Eastern countries. There were many signs of this collaboration which was known as the concert of Europe at work. The German, French or Italian traders and missionaries had social union with the British rulers, and businessmen and they enjoyed privileges as if they were members of the same governing class. But the War gave a mortal blow to European solidarity. With the internment of the German and Austrian missionaries and traders, the people of the sub-continent marked the disintegration of European solidarity and the humiliation of the white races. Simultaneously with the awe of European superority disappearing, there was the other truth that Britain was not as strong as it seemed to be, and the British were not as infallible as they were imagined to be. The people went right into the war, and they knew what was happening in different corners of the globe. Describing his experience during the war Sir Valentine Chirol wrote: "The war lasted too long and was remote from the Indian people......The sick and wounded from Mesopotamia brought home, too often, tales of mismanagement and defeat startlingly corroborated by the thunderbolt of Kut surrender....If England has been reluctant at first to credit Kitchener's prophecy, that war would last three years, Indians were still more at a loss to understand why victory should be so slow to come to Great Britain

and her powerful Allies and they began to doubt whether it would come at all."

Having received all these impressions, and seen all these transformations, the people of the country were psychologically in a hopeful mood about their political future, but they were overwhelmed with disappointment when the war ended. They had made tremendous sacrifices in the Allied cause but still the imperialists among the British would not trust them, and show due regard for their aspirations and legitimate demands. They did not show any regard for the sacrifices of the country's soldiers dying in all the climates of the world. They entertained a sub-conscious feeling that the loyal subject was happy only when his position as a subject was accepted as truth. They regarded loyalty as more that of a faithful dog to a loving master, than to an equal partner in sacrifice with the same flesh and blood. Mr. Carl Heath wrote: "The imperialist mind is always tempted to make reservations, to see itself as belonging to a superior race and more experienced politics which gives it the right to be the ruling party. Even in its most liberal mood it retains a sense of "We to them". This disappointment and utter frustration encountered after the tribulations and hardships they had gone through, gave rise to effervescence, anarchy and agitation. The subcontinent had still to carry on its struggle, the War did not end its war. The lull during the War proved to be the calm before the storm.

That even after the declaration of His Majesty's Government defining the object of their efforts to be a Dominion Status for the country, many sad features in Indo-British relationship continued, was tragic. A British statesman declared in the House of Commons "I do not admit that imperial patriotism of a kind may not be developed among the races that are not of British origin....Given complete equality of status with their British fellow countrymen, they may not be insensible to share its burdens and its glory." Mr. Ramsay Macdonald in his speech before the British Commonwealth Labour Conference on 2nd July, 1928 declared "I hope that within a period of months rather than years there will be a new dominion added to the Commonwealth of our nations, a Dominion of another race. A Dominion which will find self-respect as an equal within the Commonwealth. I refer to India." But in spite of the sincere and honest declarations of British statesmen, matters did not improve; and the official report to the Parliament confessed that "Unfortunately, in face of the hostility of the white settlers....it is easier to press this point upon home authorities than to secure its translation into practice on the spot". We seek the aid of Prof. Rushbrook Williams to corroborate our assertions, "It cannot be emphasised too often or too clearly that Indian opinion regards the satisfaction of its aspirations to responsible government at home and the equitable treatment of Indian

citizens in other parts of the Commonwealth as but two closely related aspects of the same national demand......From many points of view indeed, it is by no means impossible that the external aspect is more important than the internal. Upon the question of her advance towards responsible government some division exists in the ranks of educated India.... But upon the question of the treatment of Indians in other parts of the British commonwealth, and the recognition of the claims of India's nationals to enjoy full equality of citizenship in every part of the Empire, there is complete and solid unanimity. It must be frankly admitted that in the past, as to a large degree at the moment of writing, the treatment accorded to Indians in certain self-governing dominions and colonies, is not such as befits the national of a country whose destiny has been solemnly recognised by His Majesty's government to be Dominion Status and equal partnership in the Britannic Commonwealth".

Dr. Rabindranath Tagore summed up the real attitude of the indigenous mind in his message to the British people. He wrote. "We believed with all our simple faith that even if we rebelled against foregin rule we should have the sympathy of the West. We felt that England was on our side in wishing us to gain our freedom. But during the interval that followed there came a rude awakening as to our actual relations. We found them at last to be those of force rather

than freedom. This not only disturbed in a great measure our youthful dream; it also began to shatter our high ideas concerning our English rulers themselves......Those who live in England, away from the East have now got to recognise that Europe has completely lost her former moral prestige in Asia. Even though Asia is still physically weak and unable to protect herself from aggression where her vital interests are menaced, nevertheless she can afford to look down on Europe, where before she looked up. I have often been asked in England to offer my opinion about what should be done at the present juncture, when things have become so critical....What is most needed is rather a radical change of mind and will and heart......I trust and hope that the best minds of England will feel ashamed of every form of tyrannical action, just as we ourselves have been ashamed at the violence which has broken out on our side. We must on no account, if we can help it, find ourselves involved in a vicious circle wherein one violence leads on to the other."[1]

Of course, the official attitude which really mattered most remained as hard and as callous as ever. The official classes were still governed and obsessed by the ideas of colour and the sense of superiority of rulership. Generally getting inebriated in their clubs, they lost all control over their tongues and in the hearing of their friends and club empolyees, they would

1. C. F. Andrews "India and the Simon Report."

start talking about the "absurd idea of pretending we are going to give the Indians self-government". Many a time they displayed characteristic insolence which the people in their general state of excitement and agitation, could not stand without kicking. Their behaviour created the acute and mortifying consciousness among the people of the subject state of their slavery. The entire official class remained cut off from indigenous life and public opinion—and even treated them as of little importance in running the administration. The tendency in the bureaucracy was that the stronger the forces of nationalism grew the more centralized, secretive and isolated it became, thereby adding more to its vulnerability and essential weakness.

The people of the sub-continent began to consider British rule autocratic and imperialistic, which accepted Japan as an equal partner but showed no deference to them in spite of all their sacrifices in the war. The Defence of India Act (which was commonly called 'The Offence of India Act'), and the rules and ordinances passed under it were so harsh and oppressive that the people began to wonder if that was the British government's response to their loyalty and sacrifices. The entire machinery of administration became a big court of Star Chamber. Acts and ordinances of indemnity conferring validity and legality on all the official excesses were looked upon by the people as standing monu-

ments of injustice. This bitterness between the official class and the people, which began in 1883 over the provisions of the Ilbert Bill culminated into the saddest episode in the country's history after the Mutiny—the Jallianwalla Bagh. The two representatives of the foreign bureaucracy and the foreign army who played the savage part in it can well be described in the words of Burke that "was there ever heard or could it be conceived that a man would dare to mention the practices of all the villians, all the mad usurpers, all the thieves and robbers in Asia, that he should gather them up and form the whole mass of abuses into one code and call it the duty of a British Governor." The people went into the genesis of this behaviour: and Aldous Huxley informed them, "To some extent we still use sport as a training for militarists. The battle of Waterloo was won on the playing-fields of Eton: and it was on these and a score or two of other school playgrounds that the Indian empire was conquered and held down. The Amritsar Massacre is a genuine, hall-marked product of the prefectorial system and compulsory cricket. 'His captain's hand on his shoulder smote, play up and play the game'. The game was played in that high-walled Jallianwala Bagh to the tune of, I forget, how many hundreds of dead and wounded." It was at this episode that M. Clementceau exclaimed that, "England can never rule India like that." With the Jallianwala Bagh and

the Rowlatt Act of 1919, the country began a new history; and above all they brought Mr. Gandhi on the country's scene.

The bureaucracy could never understand that public opinion was the best support of government and in it lay the strength and effectiveness of law; and that to suppress and alienate public opinion was not a sign of wisdom in government. The mentality of the bureaucracy remained what Ramsay Macdonald described when he said: "A power of repression habitually enjoyed tends to develop a habit of mind in the government which regards all effectively troublesome criticism as sedition". The Sedition Act of 1898, the Press Act of 1910, the Princes Protection Acts of 1922 and 1934, the Press Ordinances of 1930 and 1932; the Criminal Law Amendment and Special Powers Acts of 1931, 1932, 1935, and so on (it is indeed hateful to enumerate the measures subsequent to the declaration of the Great War II, *i.e.*, 1939 and after) could never be the means to win public opinion, sympathy and support. Very necessarily where opposition is made illegal it goes underground and develops into conspiracy—and this was what exactly happened in the sub-continent.

John Morley used to say "Call it fine weather when it is raining cats and dogs"; Japan called it an "Incident" when it was in total war with China. Modern powers call

it "Police Action" when they are actually engaged in the extermination of the whole people. It is called "love-making" when blood is sucked out of the body in kissing, and the bureaucracy, in putting its head in the sand, called it "peace and order" when agitation was rife, and jails were full with political prisoners let alone the criminals. It was not infrequently that martial law became the lot of the country whereas in England, Dicey discussed the horror and resentment that would be created if recourse was had to such measures. The bureaucracy still made profuse use of the Jirgas and the Frontier Regulations against which there was no authority to appeal to, and by which innocent men could be sentenced to penal servitude in absentia without giving them a chance of hearing and pleading. Little did the bureaucracy realize that the things which the people silently submitted to in the nineteenth century were no longer acceptable to them in the twentieth. To the people, subjection became increasingly galling to their very soul. Any high-handedness was resisted by them. They became very sensitive of anything which reminded them of their subjection.

Certainly bureaucratic measures could in no way help to learn lessons of gentleness, self-control humility and other worldliness; whereas on its part it indulged and revelled with impunity in everything un-English and un-Christian.

Sir John Strachey wrote, "Few would go further than I would go in opening public service in India to natives of proved merit and ability, but it is well to avoid political hypocrisy. "Is there" asked Lord Salisbury "any man who will have the hardihood to tell me that it is within range of possibility that a man in India should be appointed Lieutenant-Governor of a province or Chief Commissioner or Commander-in-Chief of the army or Viceroy without any regard, whatever, to his race?....Let there be no hyprocrisy about our intention to keep in the hands of our own people those executive posts on which our political and military power, our actual hold of the country depends." Sir John was perfectly right in his own time but matters had gone far after the War. The people were reminded of the words of Sir Thomas Munro who wrote to Lord Hastings "It is from men who either hold or are eligible for public life that nations take their character; where no such men exist there can be no energy in any other class of the community. No elevation of character can be expected among men who in the military line cannot attain any rank above that of a Subedar, where they are as much below an ensign as an ensign is below the Commander-in-Chief, and who in civil life can hope for nothing beyond some petty judicial or revenue office in which they may, by corrupt means, make up for their slender salary." After the War it was found that a lot of water

had flown down the Indus into the Arabian Sea. Many sons of the land had been admitted to the superior posts and became minor wheels in the bureaucratic machine. Discontent began to prevail among them too, because they had no opportunity to aspire for higher posts in the administration. The bureaucracy remained perfectly fortified in its position, and the Reforms Act of 1919 introduced a new element of discord in the country.

In the working of all constitutions, there is always a visible struggle between the executive and the legislative functionaries for the possession of power. In the sub-continent there existed the anomalous situation that the executive had the superior power and the legislative comparatively none at all. The autocratic and arrogant officials who really controlled the work of administration could not reconcile themselves withthe levelling effects of the reforms however minor these were. Parliamentary government meant discussion and the bureaucracy believed in command; the cleavage was inevitable. They could not tolerate any criticism of their measures which, even if constructive, they considered hostile. Opposition by anyone from outside was something they were not accustomed to. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald put the very pertinent question, "Gentlemen, a government of Archangels could not help going wrong and making dreadful mistakes

without an opposition. Where is your leader of opposition?" It was found that real leaders of opposition were either outside the recognised institutions of the government, or mostly behind bars. But it seemed that the time was very hard on the bureaucracy. British political ideas gained ground in the sub-continent in the teeth of official opposition. Indeed the bureaucratic form of government—purely and plainly supported by military force—was growing to be an anachronism in the twentieth century life of democracy.

Repeated warnings were given that, "Englishmen cannot govern a people without understanding it and the understanding of it must be gained through a knowledge of its languages, its literature, its institutions, its customs, its poetry, and mythology, its land and agriculture," but the bureaucracy which had acquired a fixed and stereotyped mentality could not understand, even heed, these warnings. Sympathetic British officers who showed even casual interest in indigenous life were generally reprimanded by superior authorities "not to mess about " in the local affairs and keep off. Socially such officers were ostracised by their fellow countrymen in order to teach them a lesson. Thus the bureaucracy continued to live a narrow life and behave regardless of human sentiments. The result was that the personal and intimate relations between the rulers and the ruled could not grow. Estrangement between the two

peoples became alarming. Both the countries needed new harbingers of truth and friendliness to cement the bonds which were in danger of being permanently snapped. The political conditions exercised growing influence on the minds of both, and they were so powerful in influencing the social field that many a time business and commercial connections with the British were maintained but social relations never improved.

It was getting increasingly clear to all the saner elements among the British that the sub-continent could not be governed for ever—and under existing pathetic conditions, any longer. The two wars had made the sub-continent con scious of its greatness and importance; and more than all they had increased ever more its "Nuisance Value" in the East. President Quezon of the Philippines declared. "Without a free India no nation in South East Asia can be free". It was getting increasingly clear that the economy of the sub-continent and South East Asia was complementary, and the War (1939) left no doubt about it. The sub-continent stood in danger of running right into the Asiatic complex that was sweeping over that part of the globe. What a danger it would be to Britain, was realized by many Englishmen. Mr. Lionel Fielden wrote, "An India permanently alienated from Britain and falling willy-nilly into an Asian power group in a race for material gain will be a threat not only to Britain herself and to the

British Empire but a threat also to world peace. An India friendly and grateful to a generous Britain could provide, as perhaps no other country, a much needed link between East and West." It was recognised that a discontented and a bitter country will be no tribute to the British rule. The country was being ignominiously lost through the follies of the bureaucracy. The country was to be won over in the interest of both England and herself. A frustrated sub-continent in perpetual hostility would be the surest means to undermine British influence in the East. With their cooperation Britain would still continue to enjoy influence in the East for centuries to come. It was increasingly recongised that the fundamental change needed to create good will was the change of heart, the shedding off of the notions of racial superiority and distinction. Col. Osburn said that "such notions were bound to result in a dangerous explosion almost certain to involve the whole East........ Such an explosion will probably in the end bring about extinction of British influence in Asia......For nearly a quater of the human race lives in the Indian peninsula".

Many British souls realized the harm that bureaucracy had done and was doing to the Indo-British relationship. Scores of them came forward to educate the British public. In this great missionary work hundreds of them joined. Some worked in public and the others worked away from the public gaze to win the

country for Britain. Great events were taking place in the great sub-continent and the object of these British patriots was to inform the British public of the course of those events. Thus the truth which the bureaucracy tried to hide, began to leak out. In spite of all the efforts to stop the flow it became a torrent. Simultaneously there was the world interest focussed on to the sub-continent. This political crisis began to loom large in the international sphere and a vast amount of literature on it deluged the world book market. It was no longer possible to govern the country under a thick blanket of secrecy. The British public was warned what a loss it would be to England if the sub-continent was lost through their lack of interest in it. It was emphasized on all hands that the only successful effort to win the country could be undertaken by the British people—British administration had not only repeatedly bungled but hopelessly failed.

It was the silent and unostentatious efforts of many selfless Englishmen which inspired a hope that whatever the solution of the country's own problems, it could always count on the collaboration and goodwill of the British people. Not long ago Sir Henry Cotton wrote. "A spirit of devotion to the people of the country is not inconsistent with, and has never obliterated, my sense of official duties. The benefits we have conferred will never receive their due fulfilment unless we can raise oursel-

ves above associations of the official grove, and prepare ourselves for the exercise of higher functions than those of mere administration. The Government has deliberately infused new life into the Indian nation, and must not shrink from the responsibilities which are involved in giving full effect to this policy". Some of them began to speak the truths which were never known to the British public. Col. Osburn wrote, "we undermined the entire social system, and the disarmed and submissive Indian, not being free to develop his own defensive mechanism against social chaos, has put nothing in its place; and we, because we feel we deserve his resentment, because we fear our own safety, desire no substitute". Mr. Penderel Moon a senior member of the Indian Civil Service resigned his post and becoming free, he courageously wrote "by hook or by crook British rule must be brought to an end".

But the greatest and the noblest among the British and foremost in this mission was the Rev. C. F. Andrews. The injustices against the Indian settlers in South Africa moved him to activity. He went to Mr. Gokhale with a purse of rupees 1,500 (£115) for the South African Fund and said to him: "This is all I have. Please take it and send it to South Africa. I am sorry I have no more". He cultivated the intimate friendship of Mr. Gandhi and Dr. Tagore. He had Muslim friends all over the country and maintained a

constant contact with the Aligarh movement. He was an English patriot who did not see any reason why he, as an Englishman, should connive at the official excesses and silently look on while all kinds of outrages were perpetrated in the fair name of his country. He, as an Englishman, could not see any reason why he should not love the sub-continent, just the same as he would love England. A tribute was paid to him by one who knew him well, that he was "one of those rare persons whose existence saves us from losing faith in humanity".

One of the thorniest problems which emerged after the War (1914) and which alarmed everyone, was the status of the natives of the sub-continent in the British dominions in general and in South Africa in particular. Prof. Rushbrook Williams rightly said that "much harm would be done by failing to recognise that the treatment accorded to Indians in certain of the self-governing dominions and colonies, is not such as befits the dignity of a country whose destiny is, on all hands, admitted to be Dominion Status". It must be recognised that one of the major causes of discontent in the sub-continent was due to the strained relations between the people of the sub-continent and their fellow white subjects in the dominions. The people of the country were psychologically sensitive to anything that honoured them, and their country, and elevated them and their

country in their own eyes and in the estimation of other countries. They exhibited a strong desire to acquire national dignity and prestige and to be recognised among the foremost nations of the world. "There has arisen" wrote Prof. Rushbrook Williams in 1924, "a fixed determination to be content with nothing less than control over their destinies, combined with a burning resentment against any conditions as would seem to stamp Indians with inferiority to the free peoples of the world. The quick pride of sensitive people has suddenly awakened to the fact that in the world's estimation, as evidenced in innumerable ways, their status falls far short of their measure of their own worth". Indeed the treatment of country's nationals overseas strongly stimulated national sentiment, and reinforced the desire for independence.

What the emigrants had done for Africa can be judged from the words of a die-hard like Mr. Churchill, who has had an amusing record of antipathy to indigenous aspirations. As Under Secretary for the Colonies in 1908 he declared in Parliament; "It is the Indian trader who penetrating and maintaining himself in all sorts of places to which no white man could go, or in which no whiteman can have living, has more than anyone else developed the early beginning of trade and opened up the first slender means of communications"[1].

1. Agha Khan "India in Transition."

The treatment of nationals of the country in Canada and Australia which followed a policy to remain white, forced the people, to strive to live their life outside the British Commonweath, which had proved itself white in character, and in which they could not expect even the normal and primary civic rights for themselves. The people became increasingly conscious that any growth on the lines of British Dominions was not possible due to reasons racial, religious, historical and political. Despite the Reciprocity Resolutions at the Imperial War Conferences of 1917 and 1918, despite the Imperial Conference of 1921, the emigrants were still dubbed as an "Asiatic menace" and their status remained far from satisfactory. Recognising the gravity of the issue Prof. Rushbrook Williams informs us, "It is the task of British statesmanship—and there have been few heavier laid upon the shoulders of mankind—to convince India that whatever the remote future may hold for the Indo-British connexion, there is room for her within the Commonwealth to rise to the full height of her national stature, and to attain those noble privileges, coupled as they are with grave responsibilities, which the self-governing dominions enjoy". Thus the problem of the country's nationals overseas emerged as a very delicate post-war problem which became a convenient excuse—and justifiably so—for the nationalists to attack British rule and British institutions.

The problem of the country's nationals overseas, especially in South Africa brought Mr. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi to the world scene. During this period of discussion if there has been any individual to whom can be attributed the course of events in the country, it was Mr. Gandhi. A mystical and mysterious personality, a master of mass psychology, a firm believer in non-violence as a principle of life and in non-violent non-cooperation as an instrument of attack against British administration, Mr. Gandhi had more or less continuously dominated the country's life since the beginning of the 20th century. Never in history a man so frail and so fragile —a naked faqir—commanded and disciplined so many by sheer force of personal character, terrified and shook to its foundations an empire of power and might as great as the British, faced tremendous privations and tribulations in life but still lived to see and enjoy the satisfaction of the fruit of his labour —wholly won by him but partially snatched from him by another—and be disappointed in the glory of his success.

There was something mystical and enigmatical about the public life of this most outstanding personality on the country's political scene. He swept away everything and everyone before him. Though not even a member of the National Congress, he came to be known its "permanent president". The entire Congress organization became synony-

mous with him. He could make it impossible for a duly and constitutionally elected president to work if he differed from Mr. Gandhi in the slightest degree. He became an inveterate enemy of Western civilization and all that it meant. He spoke about it as a "brute force" leading directly to war. It was a "curse in Europe, so also in India". He believed that Western civilization had undermined the very foundations of indigenous society. He believed that: "One effort is required and that is to drive out Western civilization. All else would follow". He attached little importance to reforms and to education. It came to be believed that wherever Mr. Gandhi made his appearance, there for the moment the ordinary progress of education was seriously interrupted. He believed that the country will attain greatness through frugality, self-control, and severe discipline. It must never tread the Western path—modern industrial life, modern great cities were a curse to it. He initiated a cult which came to be known as Gandhism which, in spite of numerous followers and praised by millions, has been also known as the cult of cowardice, ignorance, defeatism and backwardness.

Mr. Ghandi became a typical product of the East and the West, of Islam and Hinduism, of Christianity and Budhism, of ascetism and active nationalism. He declared that he had been influenced in his way of thought

and action by Christ, Tolstoy, Ruskin; and that his cult of non-violence and passive resistance was the result of his profound thinking and of real understanding of human nature. Before this English-educated barrister came to the sub-continent all the efforts of the country's constitutionalists and terrorists could not rouse the masses. When he came to it life began to change. He became convinced that a national movement could advance with a surer and quicker pace only if it was associated with religion; and he converted himself into what Mr. R. G. Casey called; "A saint among politicians and a politician among saints". With his keen and subtle sense, he created a halo around himself and so became a *Mahatma* to attract the masses. He said the country was starving and it needed bread. If Napoleon had said that "armies march on their stomach", Mr. Gandhi declared, "to a hungry man even God must come in the form of bread". He moved like a mendicant very alluring and dignified—because he said that the sub-continent was the land of mendicants. He made himself physically and mentally a true representative of the "the starving millions". He declared: "It is my frequent prayer to God that I may lay down my life in the service of the poor ... to see the all pervading spirit of truth face to face one must be able to love the meanest of creatures as oneself". He was a young student of law in England "aping the

English gentleman", now converted into the most inconsistent, non-violent, revolutionary of a type the world had never seen before. Truly in the words of an English lady he was a "positive dear but so troublesome."

If Rousseau's 'General Will' has any meaning, and if in Greece it was represented by Solon, here was Mr. Gandhi providing another instance by truly representing the General Will of the Hindus of the sub-continent. He began to perform the boldest experiments in the life of the country and claimed that all his decisions were inspired by his "inner voice". On the one hand he opened a university Commemoration Day by reading "the Sermon on the Mount" and finished with the words, "this is what we need for India"; on the other hand he advised the British, "Leave India in God's hands, in modern parlance to anarchy; and that anarchy may lead to internecine warfare for a time or to unrestrained dacoities. From these a true India will rise in place of the false one we see". While he refused to take part in army discussions of the Round-Table conference because he said the country did not need an army; all the same he declared : "Before the battle with the British government was ended, they might have to wade through seas of blood". He inculcated a strict non-violent life, whereas while leading a civil disobedience movement he would not mind declaring "after all it is an open re-

bellion". He justified his inconsistencies by returning the remark "consistency is the virtue of an ass". All his political activities revolved round his principle of "non-violent non-cooperation"—a strange combination of two negatives which do not make an affirmative.

He remained to his last day a great believer in the greatness of England and in the goodness of the British people. He advocated recruitment for the armed forces in the Great War I, because he had "faith in England". He believed that the British were as much victims of their government as the peoples of his country, and that the British administration had been of pure violence and force. He believed that violence makes men worse and non-violence better. Violence when confronted by violence must result in physical struggle. Physical struggle, inevitably created in the minds of those directly or indirectly involved in it, emotions of hatred, fear and resentment. Force had always its end and so British rule was bound to end one day. The indigenous people and the British people could not afford to be life-long enemies. Speaking about his movement of non-cooperation Sir Surendranath Banerjee said; "As far as the great leaders were concerned, non-cooperation had its roots in an intense and consuming love of country coupled with hatred of the British government, and all associated with it in the ad-

ministration of the country. But as regards the non-cooperating masses, hatred of the British government, its officials and Englishmen in general, was the inspiring impulse. And when a sentiment is firmly rooted in the public mind, it grows and expands". Mr. Gandhi was not worried about the trends of the movements; to him it was the intention which was more important. He declared: "My attitude towards the English is of utter friendliness and respect. I claim to be their friend, because it is contrary to my nature to distrust a single human being or to believe that any nation is incapable of redemption. I have respect for Englishmen because I recognise their bravery, their spirit of sacrifice for what they believe to be good for themselves, their cohesion, their powers of vast organization ....I have hope of England because I have hope of India. We shall not for ever remain disorganized and imitative.....A time is coming when England will be glad of India's friendship and India will disdain to reject the profferred hand, because it has once despoiled her."

The following statement by Mr. Gandhi reveals the attitude of his mind to various problems. Addressing the judge in his trial he declared: "And I wish to endorse all the blame that the advocate general has thrown on my shoulder....He is quite right when he says that as a man of responsibility, a man having received a fair share of edu-

cation, having a fair share of the experience of this world, I should know the consequences of every one of my acts. I know them. I have no desire whatever to conceal from the court the fact that to preach disaffection towards the existing system of government, has become almost a passion with me....I knew I was playing with fire. I saw the risk, and if I was set free I would still do so...... I wanted to avoid violence. Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is the last article of my faith. But I had to make a choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered had done an irreparable harm to my country, or to incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it; and I am, therefore, here to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty.... I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what, in law, is the deliberate crime, and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen."

Very interesting and valuable literature grew up in the country's courts where the finest and the best talents stood charging or charged. Certain trials like the trials of the Ali Brothers became an inspiring source not only for the nationalist movement, but were

in due course valued also for many other reasons. The reading of court proceedings in connexion with the nationalist movement provides a great fund of knowledge of a philosophical, political, sociological and literary character. In them we read not only the history of the nationalist movement but also the working of the minds of great leaders, their personal merits and capacities; and in them we also see the trends of the government policy. To quote a literary piece from the statment of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the great philosopher, theologian and literary figure of the Muslim world, he declared, "The inequities of Courts of Law constitute an endless list and history has not yet finished singing the elegy of such miscarriages of justice. In that list we observe a holy personage like Jesus, who had to stand in his time before a foreign court and be convicted even as the worst of criminals. We see also in the same list Socrates, who was sentenced to be imprisoned for no other crime than that of being the most truthful person of his age. We meet too the name of that great Florentine martyr of truth, the inventor Galileo, who refused to belie his observations and researches merely because their avowal was crime in the eyes of constituted authority....when I ponder on the great and significant history of the convict's dock and find that the honour of standing in that place belongs to me today, my soul becomes steeped in thankfulness and praise to God."

But the time came when if there was a problem in the country which could not be solved it was directly or indirectly so because of Mr. Gandhi. With all his sincerity and effort he had not been able to control the forces and tendencies which he himself created. If there could be any single factor to which could be attributed the Hindu-Muslim estrangement it was Mr. Gandhi. Sir Surendranath Banerjee wrote, "Of course, we all admire the supreme solicitude and the earnest efforts of Mr. Gandhi to secure Hindu-Muslim unity. But, in judging of the communal strife, which we all deplore, let us not, for the sake of historic justice, forget the part the non-cooperation movement has, in fostering and promoting it." The ideals and institutions of the Muslims were so opposed to what Mr. Gandhi wanted to bring in and bring back that they did not at all feel safe. His teaching of Hindu revivalism, his cult of non-violence, his efforts to take the country centuries back, his caution in condemning the caste-system, his insistence upon Sanskritized Hindi as a substitute for Arabicized and Persianized Urdu, his encouragement and patronage in public gatherings of ceremonials and chantings so characteristically Hindu, and essentially distasteful to the Muslims were some of the causes for the Muslims to put forth, to insist upon and to be ready to make all sacrifices for their demand to live a separate national existence. Whatever it be this too cannot be denied, that Mr. Gandhi inspired

the sub-continent with a sense ot national dignity and personal responsibility and confidence. He made the country achieve its hopes by substituting suffering for force. It must be admitted that he was a great and noble soul, a hero for millions, a god for thousands, "a dictator unarmed"; "the maker of modern India" ,"a great man of his time" and it was certainly a privilege to be known as his compatriot.

It is in this psychological mood of the nation, that we turn to the discussion of constitutional development. The sub-continent was a dependency, and so a sole responsibility of the British government; this meant that it was a responsibility of the party in power and consequently of the Parliament and so finally of the British People. But it was found that ignorance about the country's conditions worsened as we proceed in this subtle chain of authority. The people of England as such knew nothing about it and they were presumed by the government to be in no need of knowledge about it and the British government saw to it that no large scale interest about the country was in Britain. It was a closed affair to the British public—thanks to the British constitutional machinery. All that was happening in the country, was unknown to the British people. But the increasing pugnacity of national feelings forced the British government, to take stock of the situation and deal with the

country's affairs with a certain amount of realism. Unfortunately the old spirit still prevailed; and it was still called, "fine weather when it was raining cats and dogs."

The sub-continent was a country in which nothing moved without Parliamentary authority. Parliament, as such, knew so little about it; consequently the persons in authority played ducks and drakes with the power they had in their hands. It looked as if like reckless desparadoes they would not mind committing any sins to remain in power. The Great War had left the country's life extensively Westernised and fairly well organized. All the political parties and all the social classes agreed that the reforms of 1919 were utterly inadequate and that the continued existence of autocratic executive control rendered representative institutions impracticable, sham and illusory. Sir Surendranath Banerjee, himself a minister, once wrote: "The real difficulty about diarchy is that it depends upon the uncertainties of the personal element, which may vary in the different provinces, and in the same prov,nce from time to time and no hard and fast conventions can afford adequate protection. Further it may often set up two divergent and even conflicting interests (the reserved and transferred) which must interrere in that homogeneity and solidarity which is the truest guarantee of efficiency, and which in the long run secures public approbation."

The Dyarchic Scheme was devised as "a method of combining stability with progress"; and it was essentially a scheme of "checks and balances". "The division of the provincial executive into two halves according to the so-called Dyarchic plan is a constitutional experiment of daring because of unparalleled kind", was an official confession in 1921. The act of 1919 was a half-hearted measure conceived so as to appease national resurgence long before the end of the War. After the termination of hostilities it at once proved a useless constitutional document. Delhi and Whitehall in their relations with the sub-continent continued to be pre-War, whereas all over the world post-war problems were being differently and courageously faced. The tide of nationalism every time outpaced the British constitutional response; the result was inevitable bitterness and distrust. The reforms of 1919 were forced upon the country in the teeth of nationalist opposition, and the government continued to put its reliance upon its yesmen (toadies as they were commonly called) who were always purchaseable to work anything. Adverting to the situation that was thus created Prof. Rushbrook Williams wrote, "In the provinces......there had been a failure on the part of public opinion to distinguish between the reserved and the transferred sides of the government. The Ministers had been popularly identified with the executive councillors, and regarded as little else than an additional wing of the bureaucracy.

This misapprehension, strengthened as it was by the fact that liberal ministers generally supported their colleagues when the exigencies of the political situation demanded strong action, was not counterbalanced by any such development in the "nation building" departments as might have enabled the ministerial party to appeal for confidence to the electorate on the merits of their record".

Unfortunately the Reforms Act of 1919 had a very ominous and inauspicious start. It was preceded by the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh, and the Martial Law, and was followed by the non-cooperation movement. All things began to look hopeless from the very start. The first reform elections were boycotted by the nationalists. So the bitterness became acute not only between the nationalists and the government but also between the nationalists and the collaborationists. In the characteristic Hindu terminology the councils were stigmatised as "impure, unclean, unholy and polluted". These councils and reforms accentuated communal differences, and from 1924 began the history of internecine communal warfare in the country.

The legislatures were composed of a dozen skilful and competent men and the rest of them idiots and nitwits who had no conception of the nature of their work, and so remained quite indifferent to the legislative business. The very nature of the franchise was

such that only a certain class of people could get elected. Any body knowing the prevalent condition in the country could well anticipate the results of reform elections. The official nominated and the non-official nominated members continued to be the members of the councils. All subjects like Education, Local Self-Government, Agriculture and Public Health were declared transferred because by transferring them to indigenous hands (generally safe hands) no harm could come to the political machinery. As a matter of fact these nation building departments at once became victims of communal rivalries, unnecessary controversies and political manipulations. Due to the essentially political nature of the offices of ministers and due to the agitated mood of the country no strong, sympathetic and courageous persons filled the ministerial posts. Not only was the enforcement of laws by the ministerial weaklings difficult, but even the passing of laws became inadequate. Law and Order, Finance, Revenue and such other subjects were in the hands of the officials who were in no way responsible or accountable to the legislatures. The ministers in charge of the transferred departments had either to cajole their colleagues in charge of reserved departments to smoothly run their work or completely subordinate their work to the wishes of the councillors. The transferred departments were generally known as "starved departments" and remained mostly in very incompetent hands.

The ministers, in charge of the transferred departments were ostensibly and theoretically repesentatives of the legislatures, and responsible to them, but actually they remained mere show-boys of the gubernatorial authority. The ministers had no control over the permanent heads of their departments. The services were very strongly protected and control over them was in the hands of the Secretary of State who in practice delegated that authority to the Viceroy and the Governors. The special privileges and amenities enjoyed by the services left the ministers in a hopeless and ridiculous position. The principle of amateur cabinet responsibility followed at Westminster was amusingly applied by the Governors in the selection of their ministers. Whereas the Councillors in charge of the reserved departments, and the permanent heads of the departments were always members of the civil service who were fully aware of the intricacies of administration and were experts at their work, in comparison with them the ministerial incompetence became glaring and notorious. The ministers were neither the representatives of the legislatures as single units nor were they representatives of the parties in the legislatures. They were essentially the nominees of the Governors but remained in office on the strength of the legislative vote. Thus a person aspiring to become a minister (as a matter of fact a rich man) had to satisfy the Governor first and then remain at the mercy of a not very manageable and too easily

pleased legislature. These incompetent and sham specimens of ministerial authority always found themselves "unsuccessfully tying official papers with the red tape", and were "always at sea" in the transaction of departmental business. Lord Palmerston is said to have asked his Secretary to show him "the damn colonies" when he became His Majesty's Secretary of State for Colonies; whereas the country's ministers remained in constant need of clerical direction to know the places where they had to put their signatures in the official papers submitted to them.

The sarcasm of Dickens in "Bleak House" may not be so true of the formation of government in England but could very well apply to the formation of ministries in the provinces not only under the provision of the Act of 1919 but also to the ministries formed under the provisions of the Government of India Act 1935. One has only to substitute words of indigenous context to enjoy the beauty of the passage "The limited choice of the crown in the formation of a new ministry would be between Lord Coodle and Sir Thomas Doodle, supposing it to be impossible for the Duke of Foodle to act with Goodle, which may be assumed to be the case. In consequence of breach arising out of that affair with Hoodle. Then, giving the Home Department to Joodle. The Exchequer to Koodle, the Colonies to Loodle, and the Foreign Office to Moodle what are we to do with

Noodle? You can't offer the Presidency of the Council. This is reserved for Poodle. You can't put him in Woods and Forests. That is hardly enough for Quoodle. What follows? That the country is ship-wrecked, lost and gone to pieces because you can't provide for Noodle". Indeed, it was under these conditions that the country advanced on the path of constitutional development planned on the prin-ciples ofparliamentary repesentative institutions.

When the reforms were introduced in the country the people felt surprised and sceptical. It was very interesting to find that the British people who had shown no aptitude for, and faith in written and extraordinarily rigid constitutions, left nothing for indigenous and spontaneous growth in the constitutional machinery that was introduced in the sub-continent. They tried to carry through this kind of political experimentation, so unnatural to them to an extent and on a scale unknown to any country in the world before. While these were the attempts made by the British government, the people of the country sounded a different note. Pandit Motilal Nehru (father of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru) the leader of the Nationalist Party in the Central Assembly declared "I do not want a system that is not native to India. What I want the Round Table Conference to determine, is a system which is native to India and of which you have no experience in Europe and America.

Your experience of Europe and America will not avail you in the least to find out what system is native to India". Thus it was becoming increasingly clear that the people of the country were not simply opposed to the practical application of a certain system of government, but were opposed to its very ideological conception; and resented someone else devising a constitution for their country.

The Act of 1919 had provided that after ten years a Statutory Commission shall be appointed to review the situation whereas the Commission for that purpose was appointed in 1927 (*i. e.* two years before the prescribed time) because Lord Birkenhead, the Secretary of State, did not want to leave the appointment of this Commission and selection of its personnel to the Labour Government which was expected to come into power in the British Parliament. This Statutory Commission, commonly known as the Simon Commission, was appointed to enquire "into the working of the system of government and the growth of education and development of representative institutions in British India"; and "to report as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government or to extend, modify or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing therein". There was not a single national of the country selected for this Commission. The Commission had some

very hard days ahead to finish its work and produce its report. The people began to wonder that a Commission appointed to enquire into the constitutional matters, and educational system of their country consisted of the British members only without any national of the country being there to represent the country's viewpoint. This was taken to be an insult to the country as a whole, and the Commission at once created resentment, distrust and disappointment. It seemed that by constituting such a Commission, the British Government deliberately emphasised its authority and sovereignty, and bluntly suggested that the British Government was the real and final arbitrator of the country's destiny. The support shown by the Liberal and Labour parties to the appointment and constitution of this Commission destroyed the faith of the country in the intentions of these parties too. The Commission proved a grand failure. It set the country, as a whole ablaze. All cooperation in its work by people of the country was denied; and wherever the Commission travelled it was welcomed with, "Simon go back"; black flags and huge hostile demonstrations. When its report was published a politician declared that it "should be placed on the scrap-heap". Prof. Harold Laski opined: "Everything is there save an understanding of the Indian Mind. Nationalism gets a polite paragraph at the end, written as a half-dubious peroration. Gandhi, who has set half of India aflame with new dreams,

is dismissed as an administrative incident of which the significance is never seen. You cannot deal with the hopes of a people as though they were studies in logic".

Thus the report of the Commission went unread, unheeded, unwept, unhonoured and unsung. The broad points emphasised by the Commission were that nationalism was something of which note be taken, not by the British but by the rulers of the princely states too; that it was only under a federal system of government that the sentiments underlying the movement could be given effective expression; that in future the sub-continent as a whole (including the States) must develop as a unit; that the country was not yet fit for Dominion Status, and was not to enjoy any responsible government at the centre; and that the army was to remain under the control of the British Government but the country was to bear its cost. Communal representation with safeguards for minorities was evolved in order to apply it in any new constitutional set-up. These recommendations, except that they cleared certain issues did not carry any weight due to the stubborn nationalist opposition. Even some of the salutary portions of the report were disregarded and forgotton. All the efforts for any constitutional changes had to be made anew. The British government too realized its mistake in appointing a purely British Commission to inquire into the country's affairs;

and in order to allay its fears and to cool the passions of its people, the Round Table Conferences between the representatives of, His Majesty's Government and the country's leaders were summoned in London to deliberate over the country's political problems.

The initiative to call these Conferences was taken by Lord Irwin (late Lord Halifax' one of the most honest and straight forward viceroys the country had seen. He was supported in his proposals by Mr. Wedgwood Benn who was the Labour Secretary of State. The first Round Table Conference was summoned in 1930. It was opened by the King and presided over by the Prime Minister of England. In the later stages with the advent of Sir Samuel Hoare (late Lord Templewood), in place of Mr. Benn, the failure of the conferences became certain. Though nothing substantial came out of the deliberations of these conferences, yet they helped to clarify all issues. Many problems which were amorphous and vague, acquired reality. The Government of India Act of 1935 was an unsuccessful attempt, to incorporate the conclusions arrived at during these conferences.

After these conferences, communal differences became more acute and glaring. All the leaders of the country's communities had joined and deliberated over various problems facing the country, and they had, as it was

declared, agreed to differ. The religious character of nationalism was now fully recognised. The non-Brahmins organised themselves into Anti-Brahmin Parties. The Untouchables of Hinduism claimed separate existence and distinct recognition. Dr. Ambedkar declared "I do not want to escape subjection of the British only to fall a victim to complete domination of Hindus". The problems of untouchability acquired a political significance. It became increasingly clear that unless Hinduism tackled the issue of untouchability with promptness and justice it stood in danger of a disastrous collapse. The Hindu-Muslim problem emerged as the problem of the country. The differences between the two communities sharpened and became irreconcilable when their leaders sat discussing things at the same table. The Muslims saw no hopes for themselves in living in a Hindu-dominated country. The final result was that the Round Table Conference turned out to be an abortive attempt at constitution making.

Finding such fundamental differences among the leaders of the various communities Mr. Ramsay Macdonald announced his decision in the form of a Communal Award in August, 1932. Communal electorates already prevailing combined with this communal award gave further constitutional expression to communal antagonism. The principle of communal representation once applied to

the Muslims was extended to the Sikhs, the Christians, the Depressed Classes, the Anglo-Indians, the Europeans, the women, the commercial interests, the labour and the landed aristocracy. Commenting on the nature of the communal representation as it was conceived long ago, Mr. Lionel Curtis wrote: "The concession of communal representation is the greatest blunder ever committed by the British government in India. So long as it remains, India will never attain to the unity of nationhood. The longer it remains the more difficult will it be to uproot it, till in the end it will only be eradicated at the cost of a civil war. To enable India to attain nationhood is the trust laid on us, and in conceding the establishment of communal representation we have been false to that trust." In March, 1933, the British Government further announced their decisions on the nature of the new constitution in the form of a White Paper.

Under the scheme of the White Paper, the British Government appointed a Joint Parliamentary Committee under the Chairmanship of Lord Linlithgow to frame a new constitution for the country. The result of the efforts and recommendations of this committee was the Government of India Act of 1935. It was supposed to be a federal scheme of government, but it displayed features of a federal constitution nowhere to be found in the world with the remotest analogy.

It was a novel scheme which was in no way of the type of Helvetic Confederation not even of the nature of the North American Act of 1865 for Canadian Federation, not of the type of the German Empire, not of the type of Australian federation, of course not in any way resembling the federal constitution of the United States; as a matter of fact the new federal scheme was unique and unprecedented in its conception. The Government of India Act 1935 was the bulkiest document of its kind, produced by the wit and ingenuity of the human mind. Such a constitution with "wheels within wheels" and so many "ifs" and "buts" was never seen in any country before. There was no legislative enactment which the Viceroy or the Governors could not over-ride under the authority of "special powers" in the exercise of their "special responsibility". There was no independent legislative power which they could not exercise within the jurisdiction of the phrases "in his discretion" and "in his individual judgement."

The scheme was designed to come into force in two stages. The Provincial part from 1st April, 1937; and the Federal part could be operative only when the requisite number of the princely states had acceded. In spite of the preferential treatment shown to the princes in the provisions of the Act, they remained aloof. They were given a vast amount of control in the country's affairs,

whereas in the exercise of their authority in the states they remained immune from federal control. They performed amusing acrobatics at the orders of the paramount power, but they were not at all disposed to deal confidently with the people, whom they governed. But it soon became clear that even the political parties looked upon the federal part of the Act with suspicion, and were not ready to join in working it. In spite of the efforts of Lord Linlithgow (who was then the Viceroy) hostility to this part of the Act was so strong and widespread that it could not be introduced and had to be dropped. The entire scheme went down as a historic attempt—frustrated of course—at constitution making. It was proved that any constitution unless made by the people themselves was bound to fail. No superimposed scheme of a social and political nature could work for long. Every such scheme always carried germs of its own failure. Soon the Great War II created new conditions and the country again returned to the doldrums.

The War (1939) came when the recrudescence of political activities was expected on all hands. The declaration of war at once added fuel to the fire, and the subcontinent became what Sir Evelyn Wrench would call "a whole continent of DeVelaras." On behalf of the sub-continent and its peoples the war was declared, by the British

government and this created widespread resentment in the country. All the political parties affirmed that the issues of war and peace must be decided by the people themselves; and that any cooperation of the country in the allied war effort must be one as between equals, by natural and free consent for a cause, which was dear to both. The declaration of war on behalf of the subject country, without any consultation, with the central legislature or the autonomous provincial governments then functioning, became a signal for revolt. The leaders of the country began to blow hot and cold in the same breath. They, many a time, expressed their loyalty to the British Crown and praise for the allies' ideals for war, but they showed immense impatience of the bureaucratic government and the tactics by which the country was dragged into the war. Mr. Gandhi declared "I do not wish disaster to British arms". Pandit Nehru declared that "in a conflict between democracy and freedom on the one side and fascism on the other, our sympathies must inevitably be on the side of democracy." It was affirmed that "though England's difficulty is not India's opportunity" yet "whiie India was completely opposed to the idea of the triumph of Nazism, it is no good asking her to come to the rescue of tottering imperialism."

A widespread propaganda of hate was let loose in the country, and the political relations

between the rulers and the ruled were strained to the utmost. "One moved", as Lloyd George had said about the Irish situation, "in an atmosphere of nervous suspension and distrust, pervasive, universal, of everything and everybody......It was a quagmire of distrust which clogged the footsteps of progress". The year 1942 proved the saddest in the history of the country. With the declaration of Mr. Gandhi that the Cripps offer was "a post-dated cheque on a crashing bank" the country increasingly degenerated into chaos.

The entire civil administration fell out of gear; and nothing was attended to by the administration which did not directly advance the war effort. Thus all confidence, of the mass of the people, in the integrity and strength of the administration was shaken. Orders were obeyed through fear but not through respect. Emergency powers were resumed by the governors of the provinces; and the country was ruled by a bewildering succession of indiscreet ordinances issued without any consent of and discussion in the legislatures of the country. The sub-continent became a fit field for hostile foreign propaganda and was in the throes of internal effervescence. The defeats of the Allied armies in the East and failure of political feelers and missions at once converted it into a menagerie of wild animals beyond all hopes of control. Madness seemed to have affected

both the people and the government. Some of the political leaders went behind bars, some went underground and others stood dangling to exploit every situation that arose. Even the Courts of Justice, as at no other time before, became Courts of Star Chamber and military tribunals—the indiscretion of the administration reached fantastic limits. On top of all external dangers and internal chaos, the country was caught by a huge famine. Even when there was misery, death and desolation all round, the political parties stood adamantly and inexorably demanding a pound of flesh. All subsequent events are too recent to take us into further discussion, but it became increasingly clear that the sub-continent was no longer a governable country.

The introduction of parliamentary institutions created interesting repercussion in the life of the country. With the introduction of British parliamentary institutions came in vogue the British parliamentary language, traditions, and conventions which were a perfect imitation of Westminster. One felt amused at expressions like: "A flagrant infringement of the liberties of British subjects and a subversion of the principles of constitutional government" coming from the lips of the country's legislators. Even the ceremonials and external settings of the Assembly Houses were copied, and modelled on lines of the House of Commons. The speaker, the party composition, the whips,

the mace, the clerk of the House, the general parliamentary mannerism, the rulings of the Speaker of the House in which precedents at the House of Commons were cited as authoritative, the protest of disaffected members when bodily removed from the Assembly Chambers (exactly reminiscent of the members of the Parliament under similar predicament) the characteristic parliamentary terminology in the House of Commons and so on, did not convince anyone who came to the Assembly or the Council Houses as to the failure of parliamentary institutions in the country.

On the other hand these institutions became the arena for various political parties to show their strength and piously ventilate their views, just or unjust, under Parliamentary immunities and privileges. Party and social squabbles combined with private and personal grudges, vitiated the entire atmosphere of the so-called popular institutions. Essentially the spirit behind the laws and the working of parliamentary institution was not positive but negative and obstructive. When in 1924, it was decided by the nationalist parties to contest reform elections (which they had initially boycotted), the decision was taken not with a view to working the constitutional machinery but with a view of wrecking it from within. This negative spirit continued even when provincial autonomy was introduced in 1937. All the political parties

vied with one another, to snatch what they would and obstruct what they could, by making full use of all the constitutional instruments that were provided.

Socially the effect of parliamentary institutions was worse still. In the sub-continent elections became a big business enterprise—to fight an election was in every way a capital investment. The illiteracy and gullibility of the indigenous electrorates had been well-known, and the parliamentary institutions at once became convenient instruments of oppression in the hands of the upper classes and the bureaucracy. Thus the popular institution in every way advanced the misery of the common man. Any creation of circumstances in which an individual would have the least opportunity to behave as an undesirable citizen was not supposed to be a concern or duty of either the legislators or the government. The parliamentary institutions gave added opportunity to the indigenous aristocracy for self-aggrandisement and exploitation of the poor. In the new scheme of government, the rule of the sword and the gun seemed to have in actual practice disappeared or could not enjoy an undisputed and free field, but there was introduced the subtle rule of law which made the control of the legislative institutions as important for the aristocracy as the possession of any instrument of intimidation and exploitation. All the local government

institutions, the provincial and central legislatures were monopolised by the people whose qualifications to contest and win elections were all but competence and suitability for the business transacted in them. "The lust for power" and "craving for personal dominance" (to use characteristic phrases) were the real motive "to capture" the legislatures. The legislative institutions were employed as safe and very potential instruments for power and position. By 1939 it was proved beyond any shadow of doubt that it was not possible to successfully transplant British institutions on to the country's soil; the faith of 1919 and the hopes then entertained had proved illusory and extravagant.

There was much truth in what Lord Curzon said on 23rd February, 1909, "I wonder how these changes will, in the last resort, affect the great mass of the people of India, the people who have no vote and have scarcely a voice. Remember that to these people, representative government and electoral institutions are nothing whatever. The good government that appeals to them is the government which protects them from the rapacious money-lender, and landlord, from the local Vakil (lawyer) and all the other sharks in human disguise who prey upon these unfortunate people. I have a misgiving that this class will not fare much better under these changes, than they do now. At any rate, I see no place for them in these enlarged

councils which are to be created, and I am under the strong opinion that as the government in India becomes more and more parliamentary—as will be the inevitable result—so it will become less paternal and less beneficent to the poorer classes of thc population." Indeed, the fear of Lord Curzon was justified, but one simply wonders what actually the government had done even in the regime of the noble lord to alleviate the suffering of the poor. Was it not the paternal authority of the rod? Mr. R. L. C. Foolitt in his article "India in Search of a Future", contributed to the "World Review" of August, 1947, commenting on the "superficiality of British institutions" wrote, "nearly always they have led to moral degeneration and travesties of justice. The Britisher is deeply aggrieved. Believing his system to be the highest manifestation of organised, corporate social life, he can only account for their failure to work in India by roundly condemning the Indians.... The British would have done well to build Indian administration on the village Panchayats, or elected councils, which they found already in operation settling disputes, collecting taxes and organizing education; instead, they threw the Panchayats overboard and, with understandable and misguided conceit substituted their own systems of law and administration without bothering to consider whether the civic sense, on which these systems relied, was capable of sustaining their weight. It was not. Hence the easy perjury

in court, the miscarriages of justice, the inefficiency of District Boards, the unreliability of provincial assemblies, the nepotism, the accent on communal ratios in provincial government appointments. It is not that Indian standards are fundamentally lower than British standards; merely that they are different".

While this constitutional development continued by fits and starts, and with such disastrous consequences, the nature and composition of the political parties too passed through many changes. The country was increasingly falling into chaos and confusion. The failure of the Simon Commission proved many things to the British Government. After that all the efforts were concentrated to bring the sub-continent within the definition of Dominion Status. Lord Irwin, the Viceroy, was authorised to declare that, "the natural issue of India's constitutional progress, as contemplated in the announcement of 1917 was the attainment of Dominion Status"; whereas the nationalists declared that "the whole conception of Dominion Status for India was as dead as a door nail". It was getting more and more difficult for the people of the country to acquiesce in the British control. A gradual process to attain even heaven was abhorrent to them. All the authority of British Parliament over indigenous affairs became intolerable. All reforms were looked upon with suspicion;

all pledges by the British Government were denounced as not meant to be fulfilled. The idea gained ground that the British government stood against a reformed, healthy and strong country. When the Act of 1935, was announced, it was denounced as a "new charter of slavery." All these tendencies forced national movements to be more definite in their demands and more explicit in their views. In course of time all the smaller political parties began to disappear and there emerged two political parties—the Indian National Congress, and the All India Muslim League—with different, nay, antagonistic ideals and objects and with antithetical proposals for the solution of the country's problems. After 1937 the parties were openly drawn in battle array against each other. There were offensives and counter-offensives, statements and counter-statements, efforts by one and obstructions put by the other, the Congress said "Quit India" and the Muslim League said "Divide and Quit." In short, all kinds of campaigns were let loose in the country and it was getting increasingly clear that any constitution for a united country was impossible. The two communities stood irreconcilably apart. All the smaller communities and sections of the population ran to take sides, wherever they found the greatest scope to gain. The Parsis, the Sikhs and the Indian Christians sided with the Congress. The Muslims stood alone to claim a separate homenlad. The

talk about civil war became open and unconcealed. The sub-continent was growing to be a powder magazine.

The provincial autonomy introduced by the Act of 1935 created new tendencies, new problems, new situations and new complications. Its working not only accentuated the Hindu-Muslim differences but generated a new spirit of provincial patriotism in the country. A brief account of the position of the provinces will not be out of place here. There were eleven provinces, with a Muslim majority in five. They differed in language, in culture, in history, in economic conditions, in traditions, in dress and in many other ways. There were certain provinces which had entertained traditional hostility to others, and a vast amount of folk-lore sprang up in mutual condemnation and derogation. Provincial patriotism of a rudimentary character grew up after the working of the Reforms Act 1919. It was weak then, because the provincial administration was weak and the share of the people in it was very small. Provincial isolationism became conspicuous after 1937 because the provinces then began to enjoy wider powers of control and the provincial administration was more popular.

After the introduction of provincial autonomy, every province began to develop as a state by itself, quite unmindful of what happened to others—many a time some of the

provinces prospered at the misery and loss of others. Even members of the same religious community would not desist from attacking one another,—sometime even physically—in the provinces, and maintaining a certain subconscious apathy if not hatred in their relations. The basic cause of this provincialism was economic. Provincial economic nationalism, thus began to play a very great part in provincial legislation and there were created strong barriers to provincial intercourse and trade. Certain provinces remained in constant danger of being absorbed by the stronger and bigger ones. The ostensible unity created by the English language and English institutions began to disappear due to the spread and continued existence of those very institutions. It is a well recognised historical phenomenon that "the use of a common language is consistent with the existence of the strongest antipathies between different communities." If they inspired unity, they inspired disunity too....English was mainly employed as a language of attack—because it was an intelligible language which could effectively carry home the force of argument. Many subordinate groups raised their heads and began to clamour for rights and privileges. Many ancient feuds and rivalries were revived and all kinds of wrongs, real and imaginary, were voiced. So the problem of the country was getting hopelessly embarrassing. Provincial patriotism was still in an embroyo-

nic state. All local sentiments stood controlled by superior religious and cultural sentiments; but they stood prominent enough to convince what a threat they could prove to the peaceful development of the country.

Lord Curzon, while defining the princely state system, declared "the ties between the Indian princes and the British Crown have no parallel in any other country of the world. The political system of India is neither feudalism, nor a federation, it is embodied in no constitution; it does not always rest on a treaty; it bears no resemblance to a league. It represents a series of relationships with the Indian princes, under widely differing historical conditions, but which in process of time have gradually conformed to a single type". In the mind of the average Englishman the conception of the sacred nature of a treaty or an agreement was so strong that if he did not know the exact nature of it, he always regarded any infringement of that treaty as a moral outrage and a political blunder. The average Englishman knowing little, as he did, about the country and lesser still about the princely states formed a very queer conception of the local princes; and always viewed them as standing on par with any other ruler or the head of a state in the world. C. F. Andrews wrote: "While we hear in England about the treaty rights of the prlnces which must be strictly observed, we hear little of the rights

of these poor people from whom the puppet Rajah derives his revenue with the help of the military power of Britain". This mistake was being committed even when Britain was finally relinquishing control of the administration of the country. No effort was made at any time to inform the British public about the true nature of these facts either by their government or their press. Essentially all the information about the sub-continent in the British press remained either false or too sketchy to be taken as true. That facts of a secret and outrageous character would never be acceptable to the British public, was fully known to British administrators, politicians and the press. They always found it much more convenient to speak about their sacred nature, than about their profane contents.

The Act of 1919 for the first time provided for the institution of a Chamber of Princes in which the states got representation according to their size and prestige—to be more precise according to the number of guns permitted to be fired in their salute. About 108 out of a total of 562 or so got independent representation and a further 127 were given the right to elect 12 representatives to the Chamber. The rest being ignorable units—many comprising of a few acres of land—went without any representation. Thus for the first time—except at ceremonial Darbars—a common meeting ground was created for the princes to deliberate upon problems of common

interest, essentially in opposition to the nationalist movements. In 1921 the Chamber was opened at New Delhi by the Duke of Connaught and he read out the King's proclamation which said: "In my former proclamation I repeated the assurance, given on many occasions by my royal predecessors and myself of my determination ever to maintain unimpaired the privileges, rights and dignities of the princes of India. The princes may be assured that this pledge remains inviolate and inviolable".

But the mounting tempo of nationalism increasingly disturbed the princes in spite of the official assurances and consolations. The people of the states began to agitate for political rights and popular institutions. Even when reforms were introduced in the rest of the country, the autocratic rule in the princely states continued. The people of the states had no right of public meeting (All-India State People's Conference met in British territory and no state permitted its active workers to enter the state territories), they had no press, no representative institutions and no independent and trustworthy judiciary. Here be it said, to the credit of the British government, that on the whole it was much more at a loss to justify the excesses of the princes and felt much more bashful than the princes to uphold them. The British government, many a time, was found much more amenable to reason and principles of

political and moral decency than the state rulers. Frequently it was forced to intervene in the affairs of the states when it was found that public criticism was too just and too strong to ignore it or to flout it. The state rulers were often forced by the British government to do the right thing.

The political parties working in the country showed a growing interest in the princely states, and they started systematic assaults on the princely order. The people of the states were described as "commodities" and at the disposal of a rule which was "a negation of both democracy and self-determination". But it seemed that the changed times did not bring home to the princes the truths of the time. Extravagance and excesses in the states became ignominious, but still the rulers of the states remained perfectly secure. Slowly but surely it became clear after the war (1914) that in any future constitution the princes too, whether they liked it or not, would have to fall in with the rest of the country. It was no longer possible to leave them as diseased parts of the sub-continent contaminating the entire life of the country. A resolution of the All-India State People's Conference declared: "The Indian state system is completely out of date, semi-feudal and an obstruction to the progress and advancement of the people. Autocracy as embodied in the system has long ceased to exist in every part of the world and the progress

made by the rest of India demands the liquidation of the Indian state system. The close association of this system with British imperialism involves a danger to all people of India, and in the interest of the whole of India it is urgently necessary to put an end to this association and to make vital changes in the system. These changes must necessarily be in the form of responsible government".

In an age in which there had grown the consciousness that *Vox Populi Vox Dei* the princes still believed in "I am the state" and "I am the law". These custodians of the principle of the Divine Rights of Kings, still believed that the law and the people must serve the King; and that the king was without any obligation. This attitude of the princes was no longer tolerable. Their isolation from the people was realised to be sinister and mischievous. It was believed that it was time the princes considered their interests not exclusive, but in the context of the country as a whole. But the imperial power always came to the rescue of the princes, whenever they were harassed by the political parties. The Princes' Protection Acts were passed by the government to protect the rulers of states against the people and from press criticism in British territories. Lord Irwin consoling the princes in their trepidations announced, "I make no secret of my view that in any proposals that may be made, it is essential on every ground of policy and equity to carry the free assent of the ruling

princes of India, and that any suggestion that the treaty rights, which the princes are accustomed to regard as sacrosanct can be lightly set aside, is only calculated to postpone the solution that we seek". Thus, every effort was made to define the undefinable position of the states, and by various declarations and pronouncements the British statesmen gave the princes a certain false sense of power, importance and security, whereas their true character no one knew better than the British administrators themselves. They fully realized that as soon as British support was withdrawn the princely order will fall down like a house of cards. The very fact that the British Government had an exclusive control of foreign relations, of inter-state relations, a general (essentially depending upon the circumstances and the nature of the case) responsibility for internal administration, and had a right to demand subordinate cooperation from the states in any military policy—internal or imperial—proved beyond any shadow of doubt the hope- less dependence of the princes upon the paramount power.

The frequent pronouncement of the sacrosanct nature of the rights and privileges of the state rulers flushed the princes with an extravagant and illusory sense of greatness and importance, and they became bold enough to shake off the British control under what was known as "usage and sufferance". The bold letter—rather premature—of the Nizam, the so-

called premier ruler in the state system, was the result of this delusion which had caught the princes. The Nizam was reminded of his real position and pulled up to entertain no false conceptions of his power in a letter from Lord Reading, the Viceroy, in March 1926. The Nizam was informed "I regret I cannot accept your Exalted Highness' view that the orders of the Secretary of State on your representation do not amount to a decision. It is the right and privilege of the paramount power to decide all disputes that may arise between states or between one of the states and itself"; the Viceroy went on to emphasise "the sovereignty of the Crown is supreme in India......The consequences that follow are so well known and clearly apply no less to Your Exalted Highness than to other rulers that it seems hardly necessary to point them out....The British Government is the only arbitrator in case of disputed succession...... where imperial interests are concerned or the general welfare of the people of a state is seriously or grievously affected by the actions of its government, it is with the paramount power that the ultimate necessity for taking remedial action, if necessary, must lie". In these words was the Nizam told to be contented with what he had in perpetual prayer to God for being left in peaceful possession, instead of losing all he had if he was so disposed.

But the restiveness of the princes at the officious interference of the paramount power

in their internal affairs necessitated the appointment of a Committee in 1927 (known as the Indian States Committee) under Sir Harcourt Butler. This Committee was asked in its terms of reference to report on the rights and obligations arising from the relation of the States and the British Government in connexion with the treaties, *sanads*, engagements, usages and so on, to enquire into the financial and economic relations between British territories and the princely states, and to make recommendations for their adjustments. The Committee after its investigation and deliberation recommended certain specific measures; but without in any way defining paramountcy declared that "paramountcy must remain paramount". This was a firm reply to the princes to remain calm and composed; if not the invisible but immensely powerful hand of the political department would choke them at any convenient and expedient moment without the least compunction or show of mercy. Thus reminded of their true status, the princes began to grow amenable to reason, and they joined the deliberations of the Round Table Conferences. They agreed to join in the future constitution of the country provided their rights and privileges (what exactly these were no one knew) were safeguarded. The Act of 1935 made the federal part of the scheme operative upon the accession of states in a stipulated form; the requisite

states did not accede and that part of the Act never came into operation.

After 1937, as the political parties began their activities with a new vigour, the princes by the force of circumstances fell into a bargaining mood: they felt disposed to negotiate with the party executives in order to be able to retain by negotiation and supplication what they could, instead of losing all in an open fight.

Before proceeding further with the discussion it is very necessary to form an idea of the nature of the local self-government in the country; and of the working of its institutions. Under the scheme of the Reform Act of 1919, Education, Public Health, and Public Works were transferred to the elected representatives, and thus made victims of political controversies and incompetent handling. It was a growing tendency of the administration to transfer all work of education, public health and roads to the local authorities when they had proved disappointing in even the management of their clerical establishments. Education, Public Health, and Roads became victims of utter incompetence. The history of local self-government in the sub-continent makes a very sad reading; and it becomes sadder still when it is observed that in spite of the proved failure of every local authority the work of public welfare was more and more put in their charge. We

shall start with the official confession in 1921 that "Municipalities and District Boards proved themselves indifferent because powers entrusted to them were, as a rule, insignificant".

The country, on the whole, essentially suffered due not only to the all round incompetence but also to the cowardliness of the local authorities. The Local Government institutions suffered from internal disorders because there was noticeable the pernicious tendency towards the formation of communal cliques and petty factions, which displayed deeprooted mistrust of one another and wasted time and money in mutual recrimination. There was neither continuity nor consistency in their administrative working—of course we do not speak about policies because these were not there. In every new term of office their interests changed capriciously, and every new controlling party would begin to indulge in new and fantastic schemes while allowing the half-finished or hardly begun old ones to deteriorate by default.

The continued official control of the local authority institutions made matters worse. Prof. Rushbrook Williams informed that, "there continued a natural inclination to administer the institutions of Local Self-Government through official agency which was highly efficient, directly on the spot, and both able and willing to relieve the non-official members of the small responsibilities

actually allotted to them. In consequence, for many years, the institutions of Local Self-Government in India failed to enlist the services of that class of public spirited men, conscious of an ability to wield power, upon which the system depends so largely for its success in England and America. Hence, there came into existence a vicious circle; municipalities and district boards remained apathetic because the powers entrusted to them were, as a rule, insignificant". But even much after this observation was made (1923) till 1937 (when provincial autonomy was introduced) matters hardly improved. There were official members, and nominated non-official members still sitting in the local authority institutions. It was a common practice that an official (generally the district magistrate or a sub-divisional magistrate) was elected the president of the local authority and he continued to exercise his official awe in local authority deliberations and control. Even after 1937 it was only in a few provinces where the Congress ministers came to power that the official and nominated elements were abolished. Even where the official and nomination system was abolished, indirect and invisible but strong and effective official control remained.

Among the contributing factors for the failure and incompetence of local government institutions, were the precarious nature of the sources of their income, the callous indiffe-

rence to public good among their members, and the financial stringency all over. Financial stringency which was continued in central and provincial government affairs, was actually chronic in the local government. As a matter of fact the local government finances remained scandalous. The municipalities, on the whole, were bolder and more efficient than the district boards. The district boards had no independent staff to collect taxes; and the local cess was collected as a regular Land Revenue collection by the official machinery, and finally the local authority share was transferred to their account. It was the agricultural aristocracy which controlled the district boards; and it was the big business class which controlled the municipalities.

Though there had been an appreciable increase from the government funds from new schemes of irrigation, yet the local cess, depending upon the exclusively agricultural prosperity of the country, suffered due to continual droughts and floods. The entire agricultural nature of the country, and so the nature of local authority funds, made future planning, however small impossible. Fluctuations in the monsoons badly affected local authority finances. Generally, whenever an occasion of emergency arose and land revenue assessment was by the force of circumstances remitted, it was the local authority funds which suffered the most. So

much so that in many cases even expenses of a permanent nature could not be met. Generally all local authority institutions were in debt, and they were on the whole very reluctant to make use of the powers of direct taxation—being mortally afraid of unpopularity. They were generally averse to thinking in terms of a rigid economy in their affairs, because that might affect either the members themselves or their henchmen. The callous indifference of the people controlling the local authority affairs could be judged from the fact that the contracts for work were obtained (after comprehensive bargaining and manoeuvring) for friends and relations, even for themselves indirectly, and false reports were obtained of their completion; whereas nothing at all might have been done by way of finishing the work contracted for. The money was generally misappropriated in devious ways by the contractors, by the administrative staff and the local authority management. There were scores of instances when a great deal of money was sanctioned and supposed to have been spent on doing a particular work; whereas actually the money was entirely pocketed by various parties in perfect peaceful collusion. Worse still, the local authorities were never favourably disposed to take the hazardous course of taxing themselves. The inevitable result of all this was that every affair in charge of local authorities suffered from malnutrition and thus atrophied.

The proof of the sub-continent as a luxury state was further provided by a mere glance at its financial and military affairs. It is a well recognised fact that financial and military policy are the key-note to estimate the character of a government. The country groaned under the weight of huge and unmitigating taxation and imperial financial transactions. Though fiscal autonomy of a certain kind, under capitalist and nationalist pressure, was conceded in 1919, and the Indian Fiscal Commission in 1922 recommended a policy of "Discriminatory Protection", yet the bureaucratic system of government in actual working reduced such recommendations into a farce. Finance was still a reserved subject in British official hands and the people of the country were not allowed to touch it. The budgetary arrangements remained arbitrary and a work of bureaucratic fiat. The popular representatives were allowed the privilege to talk on budgets, whereas they were not authorised to propose any changes. Nearly 75 per cent or more of the central government budget consisted of non-debatable items of expenditure; and there were items of expenditure which were never disclosed. The Secretary of State remained both the ruler and the banker of the country. The executive decree by Sir Samuel Hoare, the Secretary of State, forcibly fixed 18d. ratio to the rupee and the entire economy was badly jolted. The currency policy was dictated by the City of London

through the India Office; and this aspect of the financial transactions reached such an alarming phase that even the semi-official English newspaper, "*The Times of India*" characterized it as "organized plunder."

Mr. Gandhi in a letter to the Viceroy of India wrote, "Take your own salary. It is over rupees 21,000 per month, besides many other indirect additions. The British Prime Minister gets £5,000 per year, a little over Rs. 5,400/- per month at the present rate of exchange. You are getting over Rs. 700/- per day against India's average income of less than 2 annas (two pence) per day. The Prime Minister gets Rs. 180/- per day against Great Britain's average income of nearly Rs. 2/- per day. Thus you are getting much over five thousand times India's average income. The British Prime Minister is getting only ninety times Britain's average income. On bended knees I ask you to ponder over this phenomenon". In spite of the huge expenditure on the army, the army authorities remained dissatisfied and grumbling to get their share of revenues increased. Lord Rawlinson, the Commander-in-Chief in 1924, tells us, "when I come away from meetings of Council after fighting for a little money for India's security (1924), and I pass the huge palace which is being built for the Viceroy, I am tempted to curse and swear". Reading a statement like this and knowing the colossal army extravagance, one simply

wondered if the army was starved, health was starved, the police was starved, education was starved, what was then in actual fact being fed? On what schemes of public good was the vast money realized from taxation being spent? One does not come across any source of official information to disclose directly where and on what.

It is amusing when one comes across complaints like these, in spite of the fact that the entire army control was in the hands of the government, and the army policy of the administration was regulated without any regard to the relative capacity of England and the sub-continent and their relative interests in defence. Even a hundred years after, the administration was not, in what the Duke of Wellington said, "in damned hurry" to reduce the strength of and expenditure on the army. Mr. Henry Fawcett, the economic expert characterized the excessive and crushing military expenditure as "a master-piece of melancholy meanness". Sir Walter Layton, the financial adviser to the Simon Commission, statistically proved that in no other country was military expenditure so excessively heavy. Sir William Mayer, the financial member to the government definitey put it down that after the war (1919) under no circumstances should the military expenditure exceed Rs. 250 million per year, whereas his advice was followed by maintaining the military expenditure at double that amount through all the subsequent years.

The 'Home charges', and the expenditure on the army were commonly known as 'drains' on the resources of the country and so long as they continued, any constructive steps for social and educational betterment were impossible. Money was spent on those items of expenditure, which in the least advanced the happiness of the common man. It was the unique fate of the country (a glance at the recommendations of the Islington Commission, 1915 and the Lee Commission of 1923 will amply prove this assertion) that every Commission was appointed on civil or military affairs finished its arduous and hard task of adding new burdens on the poor tax-payer. The services remaind 'protected' (to use the comonly understood Oriental word in the Occident) in the *Harem* of British constitutional niceties against public opinion and criticism, and constantly their emoluments were increased, the lists of their allowances were enlarged and more facilities were given to them. In the financial policy, whenever any deficit arose (which was always there) newt axes were imposed without carrying out any drastic measures for a reduction in the extravagant and crushing expenditure on administration. The famous words of Mr. Gladstone that reduction in expenditure was in "itself a source of revenue", were followed by the government by ignoring them; and every year brought new excruciating taxes. The sub-continent, like the whole world, was in the throes of economic chaos in the post-war

years and there was no relief for the poor taxpayer.

Making his budget speech in the Council Hall in 1906, Mr. Gokhale declared, "My Lord, I respectfully submit that it is a cruel wrong to a whole people—one fifth of the entire population of the world—to exclude them from all honourable participation in the defence of their hearth and homes, to keep them permanently disarmed, and to subject them to a process of de-martialization such as has never before been witnessed in the history of the world", Comparing Japanese military expenditure and Japan's military strength with the conditions in the sub-continent and declaring that it spent six times more on the army yet remained pathetically defenceless, he continued, "Japan came under the influence of Western ideas only forty years ago and yet already under the fostering care of its government that nation has taken its place by the side of the proudest nations of the West. We have been under England's rule longer than forty years, and yet we continue to be mere hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, and of course we have no position anywhere else".

Some faint voices about military affairs were heard even in the nineteenth century. In 1888 the Congress demanded the abolition of the Arms Act which had created artificial distinctions, and demanded the opening of a

military college for training officers. Long before the War (1914) voices were heard saying that if England was interested in self government for the country, it should increasingly encourage the training of its manhood for self-defence. The people resented the official assertion that "so long as India depends for her internal and external security on the army and navy of the United Kindgom, the measure of self-government which she enjoys must be inevitably limited". People of the country were still not eligible for the commissioned ranks and nationalism too confined itself to low verbal remonstrances; but the War precipitated the military issues and the Montagu-Chelmsford Report reluctantly acknowledged, "The war has thrown a strong light on the military importance of economic development".

The War, the Khilafat movement and the financial stringency caused the attention of the country to be turned to the military problems and expenditure. Just when the War was coming to a close the British Government announced its decision to admit a few Indians to the lower commissioned ranks of the army. But soon after the War the demand for the Indianization of the country's armed forces became insistent and loud. It was asserted that the need for independence was clear from the fact that the country remained defenceless for more than a hundred years of foreign rule. It was openly declared that it was

because England distrusted it, and so it kept her disarmed. The military policy of the government thus became the "touch-stone of its sincerity". The increasing interest of the nationalists in the army maintained the mood of the country red-hot and white hot. Heated debates were conducted in the central legislature on the army reforms to make the country "self-supporting in defence". Military affairs after the war were no longer outside the sphere of ordinary political life.

As a result of the growing nationalist interest in the army the government was forced to yield, but the pace of advance remained half-hearted and niggardly. The territorial force was organized and permission was given for the formation of University Training Corps. During the war a few young men were selected for the King's Commission and trained at the Royal Military College at Sandhurst, but there was no open, courageous and well-planned policy for even a slow Indianization of the commissioned ranks. The war had burst as under the old theory of the martial and the non-martial races, and it became increasingly clear that good physique in itself did not make a good soldier. The modern methods of warfare had reduced the importance of a physical giant. As a result of the Indian Sandhurst Committee's recommendations a military school was opened at Dehra Dun, "to prepare candidates for admission to

Sandhurst on the lines of the English Public School". Even then the process remained very slow. It indeed needed the portents of another war to make the British government realize the necessity of admitting more sons of the soil to the commissioned ranks of the army. Every event in the international field was taking the military problem to a climax. The recommendations of the Skeen Committee were rejected by the government because the committee included "a majority of Indian gentlemen who had no knowledge of military affairs". The recommendations of the next commission under Sir Philip Chetwode were so prejudical to indigenous interests that all the local members dissented. Lord Chatfield's Committee appointed in 1939, for the first time recommended mechanization and modernization of the army. It was only during the next war that further training centres were opened to face the war emergency.

The Second Great War came and it ended, but the problems of the country remained in "cold storage", and thus grew more and more complicated. During the hardest and worst days of war the country was in the grips of a famine in which millions of lives were lost. It was getting increasingly difficult for an alien authority to grapple with the root causes of poverty, miserable health conditions and appalling illiteracy. It still remained afraid to overhaul, or effect

any change in the convictions, traditions and habits of the people which a national government alone could venture to regulate. It was getting increasingly clear that the prosperity of the country could be the work of the people themselves; and that only by becoming conscious citizens could they be expected to make greater sacrifices for national welfare. The people had gone mad and everywhere reverberated the words of Gokhale, "Independence is my birth-right and I must have it"; and of Pandit Moti Lal Nehru, "I don't think anything deserves the name of a constitution of a country if the people of that country have no voice in drafting it".

Since the Great War I, England too found the sub-continent a costly affair, and since the economic depression of 1929 it realized that continued control of it brought little credit and lesser profit. Psychologically the people of the sub-continent were not in a position to be peacefully governed; and it was getting increasingly clear that even strong measures to suppress the national movements were no longer practicable and possible. Thus all the factors internal and external, selfish and altruistic, economic and humanitarian, combined to bring home the impossibility of "holding India for England". The administration was already much in the hands of the sons of the soil and every national emergency of England found the administra-

tion of the country slipping out of its grips. Political ideologies insidiously crept into the administration and more than all surreptitiously penetrated into the army. The machinery of government lay hopelessly in the hands of the people of the country. It had become clear, in short, in all possible manner of public expression that the old assumption that the people of the country desired the British rule to continue was no longer true—even if ever it had been so. The end of the British rule was inevitable, and the country could not be reconquered. Long ago Sir John Seeley had advised his people: "For we are not really conquerors of India, and we cannot rule India as conquerors; if we undertake to do so, it is not necessary to inquire whether we could succeed, for we should assuredly be ruined financially by the mere attempt". "Let British rule maintain itself as long as it can, and then pass away in the welter of the next world convulsion", was the exhortation of Mr. William Archer. Mr. Meredith Townsend reminded his compatriots "Asia which survived the Greek and the Roman and the Crusader, will survive the Teuton and the Slav"; and every thoughtful and wise Englishman began to repeat :—

> "If tears be the price of Empery,
> Lord God, we ha' paid in full—"

The position of the British government was thus getting increasingly difficult. Britain

found itself on a bicycle, and tried to pedal but the ground was getting more and more dangerous to try. Being on a bicycle it had no other alternative but either to move on or to get down—it could not sit on the bicycle and stop pedalling. The British administration during one hundred and fifty years or so worked like a tremendously fast whirring and whizzing top, but slowly the top had lost the force which kept it in rotation—it was wavering fast to fall down. Britain found itself, in the words of Mr. H. G. Wells, on the neck of an elephant and had missed the ladder. There was no other way of getting rid of the mad elephant but to jump off—she had to and she did. Britian found itself in the very risky boat of imperialism, and it was no longer possible to sail on the troubled waters so furiously buffeted by the storms and gales. It was perilous to go ahead and advisable to return to the shore and it did—the result was "the courageous" declaration of the 20th February, 1947, by His Majesty's Government that Britain would leave by June, 1948.

The national scene already changing bewilderingly fast showed signs of changing faster still. Viscount Mountbatten—the 29th and the last Viceroy, on assuming office realized that "history seems sometimes to move with the infinite slowness of a glacier and sometimes to rush forward in a torrent. Just now in this part of the world united

efforts have melted the ice and removed some impediments in the stream and we are carried onward in the full flood". He advised His Majesty's Government to advance the date for the transfer of power. There came a further decision that power shall be transferred on August 15th, 1947—a date which was described by Sir Stanely Reid as a "tremendous date in the history of the Human Race".

Burke is reputed to have said that "magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest of wisdom, and a great empire and little minds go ill together. We ought to elevate our minds to the greatness of that trust to which the order of providence has called us"; and indeed by this decision England had proved to the world that it had not yet ceased to produce great men with great minds and that it was not afraid to take great decisions. England and the subcontinent should proudly rejoice at the decision. The very fact that England left orderly governments, which it could as well not have left, was a tribute to its sincerity of purpose and proof of its goodwill for the people. Empires rose and fell before in history but not without a crash, or an explosion, or without the shedding of blood or without bitterness and acrimony left in their trail. It was indeed a tribute to England's greatness that it left behind not only a reconciled but a grateful country. The subcontinent was indeed saved from the horrors

of disintegration and chaos which unfortunately have not infrequently been its lot in its chequered history.

In the House of Lords, Lord Sinha declared that: "The British people had amply justified their reputation which they had nearly lost in India". Lord Pethick Lawrence rejoiced at the fact that "the sense of frustration in India had disappeared and with it any animosity towards ourselves on the part of responsible leaders of Indian opinion. We are starting with a splendid fund of goodwill and fellowship". Lord Addison realistically put it that, "it was impossible to exaggerate the perils which confronted us in India. There was growing hostility, a distrust and misbelief in us, and a growth of communal disturbances which was alarming. There was an overwhelming need for some step to reverse that hostility and to inspire confidence in us, above all to end the state of affairs so that Indian statesmen would be willing to cooperate with us......The decision to make the declaration had been amply justified, for mistrust had given way to confidence. The impulse to separate from us had been replaced by willigness to join in making the common effort that was needed". Lord Scarbrough paying tribute to the country's leaders (who were rebels once and friends now) said that "among them there were many who had been our opponents in recent times—very

friendly opponents for the most part with whom it had always been possible to preserve the courtesies of the contest. With the passing of this bill, all past controversies will be wiped out from our minds, and we wish well to our former friends and our former chivalrous opponents" Sir Stafford Cripps in his usual pious and scholarly mood said, "We have blended in a single association of closely linked and equal nations with a common loyalty the age-long wisdom of the East and the modern experience and development of the West. . . . In that long journey upon which the two new members of the British Commonwealth of Nations will embark on August 15th next, which will become a historic day, we wish them God-speed and assure them that we shall ever be by their side in time of difficulty to extend a helping hand. Their leaders, who have struggled and suffered for the faith that was in them through long and hard years, we salute now as fellow-workers in the cause of world peace and progress. May the sun which is rising on their independence never set upon their freedom and prosperity". Sir Alexander Cadogan declared at the flag hoisting ceremony at New York, "We salute the new flag representing hope in the future. With the lowering of the old flag we hope there will also sink into oblivion many things which we would rather forget. Now we can look forward to a future of common effort".

Once upon a time there was a tendency among the enthusiastic students at Oxford to vociferously declare that "India suffers from two evils, first is the English education and second British rule". Indeed it was an ebullient expression of a frustrated and agitated youth, but now that British rule was gone, enumeration of the evils of British connexion with the country will not be so easy or expressed in such an off-hand manner.

6

THE GLORIOUS END

The entire survey in this work has been, as far as possible, attempted in a realistic and unbiased spirit with a view to a true appraisement of facts and events. The British rule in the sub-continent had indeed been one of brilliant achievements and dismal failures leaving behind many splendid, and not a few ominous possibilities for the future. In spite of the fact that it had been a record of wars, adventure, romance, cold theories exploitation, racial prejudice, false arrogance, and utter artificiality; yet it provided certain instances of bold attempts to break the lethargy of the indigenous mind. In 1916 Mr. Jinnah had summed up this phenomenon thus:- "There is first the great fact of the British rule in India, with its Western character and Standards of administration which while retaining absolute power of initiative, direction and decision, has maintained for many decades unbroken peace and order in the land, administered even-handed justice, brought the Indian mind through a widespread system of Western education into

contact with the thoughts and ideals of the West, and thus led to the birth of a great and living movement for the intellectual and moral regeneration of the people".

Sir Henry Lawrence, one of the most distinguished and sympathetic British administrators wrote, "At first sight bayonets and red coats do not appear precisely the instruments of government which a philanthropist would advocate; but belie and deceive ourselves when we declare or fancy that our government is maintained otherwise than by the sword. And in pronouncing it to be so, we are far from admitting that it must, therefore, be one of oppression"; and continued, "Wellington's maxim of 'keeping troops out of sight' answered for England; it will not answer for India. There must be trusty bayonets within sight of the understandings, if not the eyes of Indian subjects before they will pay willing obedience or any revenue", and he finished by writing, "A happy admixture of just civil administration with strong hand will retain the country in peace and happiness so long as it is good that we should hold it"[1].

History demonstrates that no ruling race ever has been purely philanthropic, altruistic or humanitarian. If there were inherent defects in the Indo-British relationship, it must be acknowledged that little did

1 "Essays military and political".

the people search for internal disunity while having recourse to convenient and fashionable attacks against Britain. No foreigner can be blamed for making use of the internal deficiencies to his own advantage. Under all these conditions we cannot exonerate ourselves of the blame and lightly exculpate ourselves of the sin of having really and materially contributed to the country's misery. In the absence of any national and social consciousness, no one had any right to blame the British for not doing anything for people's social welfare. That even certain sympathetic administrators failed to carry out successful experiments to ameliorate the conditions in social life, proves for us the fact that no national and social programme, in part, spasmodic and isolated, could ever prove successful. Failure of all the healthy activities—meagre as these were—proved that so long as the British administration smelled of gun-powder (as Lord Bryce would put it) and the country's disunity continued, as long the alleviation of human suffering had to wait; that so long as English institutions were forced upon the country in the delusion that people's ideas and life could be changed by mere external laws and superficial regulating orders, so long as they continued to fail and produce dangerous results; and so long as the increase in social comforts actually meant unrestrained expansion of, and free field for, vulgar wants

and temptations, so long the social evils stayed and increased ever more.

During the half century or so events in the sub-continent moved increasingly fast, nay too fast even for the people who were taking part in them. Indeed the world in the sub-continent was rushing along at a "giddy pace covering the track of centuries in a year". The entire atmosphere was saturated with maladjustments and sinister forces of every kind in every sphere of human activity. The country was agitated by an internecine tug-of-war between religious communities, it was constantly maintained in an unstable equilibrium by nationalist convulsions, it was kept in a perilous state of uncertainty by all kinds of factors social, economic, educational and political, which characterize a society in transition. It was inevitable that burning desires, lofty ambitions, overwhelming movements and many quick processes should create effervescence and confusion in society—nay they threatened to shake the entire society to its very foundations. The whole social and political structure was false and artificial; it was designed and maintained to satisfy the military and the political exigencies of the British rule. The entire life had been unhinged by British political considerations, and when combined with the successive agitations, set a foot by the nationalist forces, it became a delicate structure indeed. It stood constantly in danger of collapsing with-

out warning, if not handled with proper care and attention.

In short all the symptoms of a diseased society and a disintegrating nation, which Lord Chesterfield saw in France on the eve of the French Revolution, had been present in the sub-continent too. All the political parties having lived a life of obstructionism, opposition and senseless activity, had developed a fixed habit of mind and they had been finding it very difficult to work together and settle down to a peaceful effort.

In the sub-continent it had been accepted as a universal truth that to achieve political and social progress would not be by patient evolution and slow process but by sudden and quick changes. The people of the country always found themselves united in their destructive schemes, whereas they fell into petty schisms on constructive policies. The people of the country during the quarter of a century before Partition, had been so fed and nourished that they psychologically looked forward to revolution with profound hope and exultation. There were many people who openly gave expression to their feeling of satisfaction at the sight of so many institutions dying what they called a natural death; but very few seemed to realise the pernicious and mischievous nature of the institutions they wished to see prevail. Thus the sub-continent stood agitated and pos-

sessed with ideas and ideals which constantly militated against the establishment of a stable order of society. Many psychological factors which were a *sine qua non* of a stable society were conspicuously missing. During the quarter of a century one marked a gradual disappearance of all reverence and respect for the established organs of the state, and indifference to—even contempt for—the governing authority; and the people seemed to believe that all authority could be destroyed by physical force alone. They railed at the existing government, sneered at and booed those in authority because life and its experience had left them bitter and disillusioned and they began to suspect everyone and everything. They had little patience to judge merit and competence, and they hated everyone associated with anything controlling them. The result was that even in the abstract all the authority of the state was conceived of as mischievous and a necessary evil if not positively dangerous and actually useless. The people, on the whole it seemed, were so much obsessed by the ideas of the changes they wanted, that they began to imagine that they could cook something great and good overnight. There was a constantly increasing tendency to question all principles and ideas, nay, many a time ridicule them if right, without waiting to think with patience and restraint. There was noticeable a certain tragic disregard of the nature of the means and a certain unscrupulousness in their use to

achieve certain ends, which ends in themselves were not by any canons of reasoning entirely noble.

The talk of Civil War was not uncommon in the country during the twenty-five years before independence. There is nothing terrifying about civil wars. Civil wars in history have proved to be the biggest blessings in disguise for nations which had gone through them. Life of absolute peace, isolation, stagnation and mere selfish effort for self-aggrandisement and satisfaction of personal appetites, history tells us, had always proved demoralising. It is rightly said that "peace is not in itself national health, but without it there can be no national health". Activity in the national life is as important as warm currents in cold seas, which prevent these from freezing . For a nation to freeze would amount to an invitation to very disastrous calamities. We now hope that having undergone the pangs and sorrows of a short civil war, and a little more prolonged and sporadic internecine warfare we are going to settle down with an eye for peace. We hope that the ideals which could be justified, recognised and applied as indispensable for the stability and continued existence of a foreign authority are not witting by, or unwittingly resorted to for the regulation of our independent national existence. India, it appeared, was fast forgetting Gandhi's non-violence, and Pakistan seemed to be caught

in a vortex of evils. If the leaders do not remain calm, cool and composed, we are afraid the two young states are not yet free from the dreaded possibilities of recrudescence of all kinds of unsocial activities which are characteristic of the states in such evolutionary processes. If we wish to prosper and grow strong, and want to enjoy the heights of national existence, which we seem to be so much thirsting for, we shall have to guard every step that we take. How far internal peace is an indispensable condition precedent to entertaining any claim to international prestige, cannot be over-emphasised. It would be suicidal for the two states to work under suspicion and to settle matters between them on principles of expediency and diplomatic compromise, at the very inception of their independent national life. India and Pakistan are still one, in a certain sense in which no two other countries could be called one. The foundations of independent national existence could never be safely and surely laid on a policy of convenience; to do so would be tantamount to building a house of sand.

Till recently there were not many reassuring and encouraging signs for the emergence of a stable order or society in the near future. A new pattern of life has now to be woven, and we can do so only with the requisite skill, ingenuity and perseverance. It is a well recognised fact that there is no single

sovereign cure for the ills of the body politic. National life possesses organic characteristics, and all the parts of the body must be nourished and sustained equally; if not, social disasters would inevitably follow. The remedy for social ills must be simultaneously sought in many fields. It would require constant effort, inexhaustible patience, and indefatigable energy to lay successfully the foundations of a stable order. There is every danger that many initial attempts would fail, and many experiments would prove abortive before anything stable could be finally devised. We should be prepared for many rude shocks which fate may administer us. But the biggest need to test progress is time—time to experiment, to commit a few more mistakes and rectify them and learn lessons, time for the psychological adaptation to the new environments and new ideas (many a time of a contradictory and baffling character) and new spirit, time for the creation of national consciousness (a consciousness which has existed in the destructive form in full force but now we need it in its constructive aspects), time to judge people's capacity to stabilise themselves, and gain confidence in themselves which they seem to have lost during the past one hundred and fifty years of artificial and precarious life. Whereas during the interval the country will remain a whirl-pool of evils and antagonistic forces which are bound to create immense misery. The pangs of birth are going to be acute indeed. It is

only the profound consciousness and realisation of the moral basis and virtues of leadership, which would make it possible for us to advance on the path of peace and prosperity.

Personality history may no longer be fashionable in the discussion of Western institutions, but in the sub-continent and the East, life still revolves round personalities and, under the conditions of foreign rule, it could not have been otherwise. The introduction of the parliamentary representative institutions at once established close cooperation between the economically powerful classes and the bureaucracy. The paramount power having reduced the princes, the aristocracy and the vested interests to utter impotence and absolute servility, allowed them distinctions, privileges and prerogatives of ostensible superiority which qualified them for nothing but a life of profligacy vulgarity and show. The East, as a whole, has been a victim of this phenomenon, in which emasculated oriental nobility stood propped up by foreign imperial powers, thereby getting not only isolated and demoralised, but oppressive too. From the very beginning it was found that parliamentary institutions so worked that the privileged classes found themselves entrenched in strategic positions. Officially sponsored political leadership (with much of show and less of substance) fell into the hands of those people who like Antaeus drew strength from the

bureaucracy. Before they could be squeezed, they had to be detached from their source of strength. The technique of selecting candidates and managing elections was such that only men of social eminence, and official position could indulge in political life with profit. The choice of the electors was circumscribed by the limited scope, both in quality and quantity, within which they had to make their selection. Even smaller was their opportunity to choose the lesser evil, being always fearful of the wrath of the aristocratic and the official vengeance.

Thus fortified in their positions, the leaders in the officially sponsored institutions became immune from public control and public opinion, and consequently they got utterly demoralised. Having secured easy power and false prestige, they le tthemselves loose to all acts of shamelessness. They acquired notoriety and lost all sense of decent human values. They looked upon themselves as outside the common social stock, and with different interests and different desires. And by behaving so, they sapped the very foundations of confidence—the very necessary condition of relationship between the leaders and the led. Thus being disgusted (due to constant betrayal) with the government sponsored leaders, the people ran to follow the leaders outside the official institutions. They mechanically voted for one kind of people, whereas they looked up

for deliverance to others who either would not interest themselves in the government institutions, or could not contest elections for various reasons. Having been disappointed in men, people began to look out for super-men ; *Mahatamas*, *Deshbanddhus*, *Rashtrapatis*, *Maulanas*, *Allamas*, Lions, Tigers and so on. To go to jail and to break every institution of the government became an act of honour and approbation; to wear home-made and hand-spun cloth was a sign of virtue. Thus the poor getting rid of the devils got into the deep sea. The loss of confidence in leadership in general became a universal complaint in the country; but simultaneously confidence in a few chosen leaders increased ever more. These leaders in common vocabulary came to be known as the 'Idols' of the nation, and they were recognised as the true representatives of the poor.

Freedom had been won by these towering trees, under whom mushrooms grew and disappeared. The freedom that was won from British control, may be lost to our leaders from whom it will be a hard task to get it back. Care should be taken to entrust national destinies to those against whom there shall not be any need of what Locke called an "appeal to Heaven". It must be watched that the morals of leaders are not different from what they expect the common people to possess; and that they

do not live lives absolutely false to the ideals they profess. In a life of respectable national existence no nation can afford to see people living double lives—ostensibly advocating the good of the people, whereas really pursuing their own selfish and ignoble ends. There should be no white elephants to exhibit one kind of teeth and eat with the hidden set. It was time that the two nations started putting their own houses in order, and created a wholesome moral life to which anyone acting in public or in private capacity should have no excuse to claim exemption. There cannot be one life for the leaders and another for the led. The mistakes of the leaders always recoil on the heads of the followers. What is really needed to pull through difficulties and be able to face the tremendous task of reconstruction, is to show a spirit of condescension, affability, sympathy and understanding to the common man and to maintain a certain flexibility in institutions in which no individual, or no group of individuals could have an easy chance to acquire a monopolistic control.

Perhaps there is nothing to which the young and the progressive national opinion in the two countries attaches a greater importance than the quick and thorough-going industrialization of the country and the development of scientific agriculture; whereas at the same time it is sad to remark that there is nothing more callous than the in-

difference observed on the whole to moral and material evils which industrialization necessarily entails. Both nations are undergoing the acute pangs of Industrial Revolution without the remedies which must be applied to counteract its dangers. Increasing technological achievements have everywhere inevitably resulted in not only the de-spiritualization, but abject mechanization of human life. Industrial enterprise up to this time has simply helped to create and increase vested interests and parasites, but has not, in any way, been instrumental in lessening social miseries and mitigating human suffering. The entire wealth of the country has been uptil now exploited, without any consideration of the common good. No country could afford to maintain hangers on sinecure posts, leeches, beggars and so on in its life, who have so freely and profusely thrived in life so long. All-round national planning has been universally recognised as the supreme need of successful national life. The sub-continent had been just a vast centre of speculation in which plans were profusely made, but nothing was actually done. In all future plans the government must provide an opportunity for the common man to live a respectable existence and to live more by self-help than by charity whether public or private; in which he should have the opportunity to pursue an occupation for which he is most fitted; and that he should have the opportunity to share the national

wealth and enjoy a certain amount of happiness which is so essential for a decent social life.

The basic and fundamental problem of the two countries still remains the village problem, which has got to be faced and solved as the problem of utmost importance, and needing the priority attention before national economy could be put right. Villages present the tragic spectacle of utter poverty, malnutrition, disease, ignorance, superstition and helplessness. The villager can by all means remain a fatalist but we cannot afford to permit him to develop futility in life. He should no longer be pacified, silenced or consoled by telling him that destitution is in accordance with the Will of God, and that he must rely upon the virtues of *noblesse oblige* to mitigate his suffering. The masses must be raised from drudgery and squalor, free from the grip of pious exploitations and liberated from the clutches of the demagogues and political mountebanks. All those conditions of life which militate against the common man living a peaceful and happy life, must be reduced to a minimum. He must be made conscious that he too is as important a member of society as any one else. All this must be achieved, if not the inexorable laws of nature will work against us. It is truly said that the mills of nature grind slowly, but they grind wonderfully fine. If we slip

too long, some day we may fall between the grinding stones and get reduced to powder.

All the saner elements in the country are convinced that in the absence of a realistic policy in the present and a far-sighted policy for the future, the artificial structure of society raised and maintained by England would topple down and the country would fall in the throes of chaos. The best minds have realised that there is no time to lose. They all want that we should walk shoulder to shoulder with, and in no way inferior to the proudest nations of the world. But in order to reach this status we should be under no illusions and hallucinations. Mere whimsical and dreamy notions of our future and wrangling talk of our past greatness will not help us to elevate our country in the eyes of the world. Let our imagination fly high, but under no circumstances should contact be lost with the mother earth. Let passions and emotions not govern us any more, but reason combined with imagination be our guide. We should remember the words of a great man who had warned, "I admit the importance of dreams in shaping our aspirations; but in practical matters we should be practical men and remember that life is not like writing on a clean slate. We have to take the words existing on the slate and add other words so as to make complete sentences and produce a harmonious meaning". We should turn to the study of his-

torical processes and find out in which direction the solution of our problem lies. We cannot afford to see the machine culture dominating us in the very start of our independent life. We have to take stock of the social evils with which we are contaminated while promiscuously aping the West. We cannot unthinkingly assume everything that the West provides. No European notions of life will help us to tackle our problems. We should be more sparing in adopting Western methods of life. Life is already too badly disorganized to stand the strains of more modernistic experiments.

Our civilization must draw strength from our moral principles of life based on our religious conceptions. Without morality civilization is inconceivable. We cannot imagine a higher civilization existing without morality, without law, without literature, without art, without science and without sound social institutions. All this is well and good, but it seems that the realities and exigencies of life are constantly militating against moral principles. Nothing is more injurious and disastrous than the separation of politics from ethics, but God alone knows how in the world as it goes, we shall be able to reconcile the two in practice.

It is recognised on all hands that under circumstances as they exist, our country can advance to its goal and avoid many dangers

in its course only when its political life has a sound basis—deriving authority and strength from within and looking up to the people for support instead of down upon them as chattels. The people of the country must be taught and encouraged to show interest in their affairs and they should be disciplined to appreciate the difficulties of the state, and when informed about its predicaments they should be ever prepared to help in the general effort. We must bear in mind that a determinate and specific goal in life must be reached by marching directly up to it, no amount of zigzag walking or running in the opposite direction would bring the country nearer to its destination. The political structure of the society must be put right and its constitutional frame work put sound, before any effort can be hopefully begun.

Democracy is the most abused word in the world and one which the people all around speak of with nauseating monotony. "Man is born free and everywhere he finds himself in chains" has been a long-played strain. As a matter of fact, degeneration of the human mind at the present day can be judged from the fact that the noblest words of human conception like 'God', 'Humanity', 'Liberty', 'Religion', 'Democracy' and so on are the worst abused. In our present day world, we still see most heinous offences committed and most savage outrages perpetrated in the name of these

sacred words. What could be more painful than to observe that our world is not yet free from instances in which all sins against humanity are committed, after pious incantations and due ecclesiastical blessings. As in the modern world it is not fashionable to discuss any human problem without dragging democracy in, we too shall toe the line.

It has become increasingly clear that democracy is at best a slow, cumbersome and expensive method of managing the affairs of a nation. A democratic form of government is a social luxury which generally gives way in times of national emergency. The success of democratic institutions depends upon many pre-suppositions and assumptions. Among the factors contributing to its successful working are generally enumerated the easy and quick means of communications, a certain amount of economic security for individuals—security which makes extravagance possible and endurable—and a certain amount of capacity among the citizens to judge good men if not good laws. At all the stages in human history democratic institutions have flourished in the centres of prosperity and plenty. The Industrial Revolution in Europe brought wealth and luxury and thus Europe could easily stand and enjoy the luxury of modern democracy. As soon as the boom period began to recede and fade away, the failure of the democratic

institutions in the West became conspicuous. We cannot possibly dismiss the rise and growth of dictatorship and totalitarian states as a passing phenomenon resulting from the clever manipulations of diabolical and psychopathic individuals. The root causes of such social aberrations lie much deeper than that. As a matter of fact it has been found that the Western democratic institutions based on party politics, work well in those countries alone which are geographically isolated, or when there is nothing of real importance to be discussed in them, or when there is peace and plenty and no national emergency. But as soon as these happy circumstances begin to disappear the so-called democratic institutions begin to suffer from serious intestinal disorders.

We know that even in the Greek city states the essential conception of democracy (which Aristotle calls Polity and of which democracy was merely a perverted form) was racial and based on artificial distinctions. The Greeks always prided themselves on the superior civilization of their cities, and to them anything outside the cities was something barbarian. The active interest in civic affairs was the privilege of a few free whose comforts and happiness alone mattered, whereas the slaves had no place in the institutions of the cities. The West deriving its notions essentially from Greece follows the same line of reasoning, and by a faulty

and subtle method of ratiocination begins to imagine that any institutions prevalent in the East are barbarian, because they do not conform to its standards. The West imagines that its civilization is higher, superior, nobler and a more normal civilization, whereas all the civilizations of the East are just spent forces and perverted forms. The criterion of a good government has always been recognised as "the greatest happiness of the greatest number"—indeed a universal and total happiness for all is unobtainable and a practical impossibility. The West refuses to acknowledge the fact that in the East "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" could be achieved by methods which may not look democratic to it. What is a democracy is still an undefined idea; and the biggest mistake and the most egregious blunder that has been committed till now, and which has proved a stumbling block in the continued peace of the world, is that the people judge the standards of others by their own. They safely apply their misconceptions and faulty notions about other peoples and their institutions (innocently and righteously) to them without the slightest sense of responsibility and bashfulness. So long as this mistake is committed and monopolistic tone of goodness, rectitude and civilization is maintained, peace to our good-old-badly-handled world seems to be as much denied as ever. That the East shall never develop those so-called

superior standards of the West so long as religion continues to be a real force and convenience plays a subordinate part in life, never strikes a Westerner. The word barbarian has a comparative significance, and it is not difficult for one race to apply it to another so long as they refuse to recognise their essential differences in social outlook and fundamental conceptions of life.

In the West there has been a tendency to dispose of religion as more or less a myth or superstition; whereas in the East we are still prone to revere superstition and myth as religion—in the former case life loses its charm, significance and purpose and in the latter case life is reduced to mere inactivity and vegetation. In the West they accomplish a thing and then formulate a theory to justify the practice, whereas in the East we always look out for sanction about the propriety of an action before we undertake it—in the former case the people become habitually aggressive and in the latter they become victims of aggression. The West has thrived on hypocrisy whereas the East has suffered through honesty. The moral effect of religion has long been forgotten by the West, and it judges morality as a utilitarian conception changing from time to time and under different circumstances proportionate to the efficient and quick use of the police force against certain actions. The West believes in morality as far as it is

convenient and rejects it without much ado when it is thought superfluous. It is still struggling to decide whether intrinsically the nature of man is good or bad. It still believes that might is right. It still believes that God having made the world is no longer in control of mundane affairs, and has no responsibility for the governance of it.

The West has been oblivious of the fact, that whatever the merits of science it has no jurisdiction over the domain of values. Science has destroyed humanity in the West. Besides, making life ostensibly and spectacularly happy, science has also worked for making it horrifying and purposeless. But now the machines which helped the West to ensalve others, seem to have turned upon it like the mad and drunk elephants of old to teach it a lesson that people do not live by physical force and greed alone. For religion it has substituted the modern word ideology; and it has been proved to the entire world quite unequivocally, that discordant ideologies are as well jeopardising the peace of the world as any religious doctrines, which the West has got into the habit of condemning. The governments and the states of today have seriously and solemnly assumed the power of divine authority—perhaps they have become more sacrosanct and godly than the old religious institutions. All this proves that religion has been conveniently given a bad name in the West and hanged.

The people of the East are fatalists indeed; they are happier to suffer by keeping and sticking to their beliefs in religion and in God, than to enjoy the expensive barbarian prosperity by worshipping the great god gun.

The religious conceptions of the people of the East demand that they believe that "the earth belongs to God and He must rule it", and not as they believe in the West that "the earth belongs to us and we must rule it"—in a rather more innocent and euphemistic style they declare in the West that "the earth belongs to the people and they must rule it". We in the East still believe that man has simply misappropriated to his own use by force and cunning, that which he was expected to cultivate and beautify for the human good. The Westerner dubs these conceptions as theocratic and so, out-of-date and ridiculous—he being monopolistic in his very historical development. He declares these conceptions medieval and in them he finds proofs of the lower degree of the Eastern civilization.

The man from the East simply looks aghast and dumb-founded at the beautiful abode of peace that the Westerner has made of this fine good earth. Associated with the conception that "the earth belongs to God and He must rule it" is the corollary of it that "in the world of God the law of God must prevail". The conception of

the law made by the legislators has never really found favour with the Eastern people. The East believes that essentially the law must not be a play thing for a few to experiment on many, and to recklessly play with their lives. The motives of the legislators have always been recognised as of dubious reliability. Fundamentally, the law must draw from the divine source, and so stand above and beyond controversy. Maintaining the fundamental conception and content of the divine law constant and binding, the Easterners believe (what the Greeks too admired) that "it is better to have government by good men than government by good laws".

The history of religion (all religions are without exception Eastern) and Eastern nations shows that the people have been raised to glory by individuals and they have been brought to ruin by individuals; but simultaneously the mischief of man-made laws has been recognised all over the world. It has been demonstrated in all modern (by which we mean Western) representative institutions that it is the economic (which certainly could not be the best) interests which have had a free field to dominate the political life. Once the legislators are in command of authority they act on the principle which an oriental proverb expresses as "the buffalo belongs to him who owns the cudgel". The legislators have always shown a tendency to identify their interests

with the general good; and they promote their interests through policies, propaganda and various methods of popular intimidation. Even in the West, the expensive luxury allowed to a few to make laws for many has been silently acquiesced in so long as the citizens are economically satisfied. Economic dissatisfaction brings the shower of abuse on the legislator; and obscene and dirty kind of abuse becomes justified under the pretext of criticism in the public interest. Subtle forms of euphemism are employed in which lie becomes 'terminological inexactitude'. We must bear in mind that the people do not really respect and obey a law which the legislators they abuse or they find abused, have made. It is the rod behind the laws which makes them obey. Willingness and spontaneity in obedience is essentially missing in the people who obey man-made laws. They call it law and order but in reality it is a state of subdued anarchy.

The allusion to 'rod', 'suspicion', 'hatred' and 'ideology' brings us to a still more modern and current subject than democracy—that is Communism. A few words about this hybrid growth which is so ominously spreading its tentacles in every sphere of human life, will not be out of place. In the East communism has had a very sinister and devilish intrusion. Its future is still uncertain in the East and much depends upon the force that religion continues to exercise over the people's

mind. We can hazard the vaticination that in India of post-August, 1947, it will have a greater chance to thrive than in Pakistan, because Hinduism will exercise lesser and dwindling influence on its followers than Islam would do. Communism has always had greater scope for its diffusion and propagation in uncertain social and religious conditions, whereas Islam seems to be a growing and increasingly cohesive force in the modern world.

Communism is essentially based on the doctrines of violence and hate. Its advocacy of snatching power from the ruling classes by violent revolution is based upon the assumption that the ruling classes do not surrender power or relinquish control, without compulsion and use of physical force. It assumes that human nature is depraved, and that all human institutions are nothing but means for the exploitation of the many by a few. Thus by assuming the grasping character of all human institutions it cuts at the very root of human nature, and at once passes verdict on the progress that man has made through the ages. The communists do not realise that human progress and social good are possible under conditions of responsibility, trust and confidence and that suspicion cuts at the very foundations of moral life. To base life on suspicion, hate and violence is in itself the basest instance of human depravity. Believing as the communists do in these doctrines, and perverted as their mentality

is, it is not difficult for them to pick a quarrel. An individual or a group of individuals can always make fighting inevitable by indulging in deliberate and persistent high-handedness and aggression. The communists do not seem to realise that violence, pugnacity and war do not resolve social ills, as a matter of fact no problem has ever been solved by the use of physical force. The hand of a communist remains subdued and docile to his scheming mind, and his mind in turn is not averse to admire the harm inflicted by his mischievous hands. Till the communits learn to govern themselves they will never allow the world to work in peace. A peaceful state of relationship among robbers and dacoits due to abundance of booty, can under no circumstances be called a normal and stable order of political society.

From now on, all those forces which the sub-continent has stubbornly resisted due to political reasons and which have not been permitted full and free play, would work with greater freedom and effectiveness. British political influence has been a passing phase in the centuries old history of the sub-continent like other phases that too has passed away. Though it has been the shortest period as such yet it has proved the most vigorous in its force and most far-reaching in its consequences. Britain found the country a single entity when it first came in contact with the country, maintained the country in

an analogous character so long as it remained in political control, and then inevitably left a divided sub-continent on its withdrawal. Though the political geography has been transformed yet English social and intellectual influence (perhaps with the advancing industrialization moral too) would remain a tremendous force; and we know that it is these influences which are in their very nature more permanent and abiding. It is in these sources that the uniting bonds between the two countries can be detected. The subject sub-continent remained either impervious to English influences or was crudely influenced by them; but now free countries would accept many things with open arms. Britain may well feel proud of the growing nations which would accept and assimilate many features of British life with free will and open minds. The influence will be much more wholesome in their results than before. The past criticism of England, that it had bled the sub-continent white by economic exploitation of its resources, that it had demoralised the people by maintaining them under political subjection was, it must be confessed, a feature of the propaganda to create political consciousness in the country. Anything was right which would hit the British administration—and hit it hard—and the people would not cease hitting. But no one, not even the most inveterate critic of Britain, ever imagined that that propaganda would poison future collaboration between the two countries. Every

one recognises the fact that if there was to be any hopeful development of national life educationally, socially and economically, the two young states can achieve much by maintaining intimate relations with Britain, and by synthesis of Eastern learning and Western knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPY

Agha Khan, H.H.	India in Transition.
Ambedkar, Dr. B.R.	Thoughts on Pakistan.
Ameer Ali, Rt. Hon. Sir Sayid.	The Spirit of Islam.
Andrews, C.F.	Renaissance in India.
Andrews, C.F.	Racial Unity.
Andrews, C.F.	India and Britain.
Andrew, C.F.	India and the Simon Report.
Anstey, Dr. V.	Economic Development of India.
Archer, William	India and the Future.
Banerjea, Sir S.	A Nation in the Making.
Birdwood, Col. C.B.	A Continent Experiments.
Blunt, Sir E.	Social Service in India.
Blunt, Sir E.	The I.C.S.
Bryce, Lord	The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India.
Butler, Sir H.	India Insistent.
Chirol, Sir, V.	The Indian Unrest.
Chirol, Sir V.	India, Old and New.
Coomarswami, A.K.	The Message of the East.
Cotton, Sir H.	New India or India in Transition.

Cotton, Sir H.	Indian and Home Memories.
Coupland, Prof. Sir R.	India, A Restatement.
Creach, Gen. Sir O'Moore.	Indian Studies.
Cromer, Lord.	Ancient and Modern Imperialism.
Cumming, Sir J.	Political India—1832-1932.
Curtis, Lionel	Paper Relating to The Application of Diarchy to the Govt. of India.
Curzon, Lord	British Government in India.
Davies, C.C.	The Problem of the North-West Frontier.
Hartog, Sir P.	Some Aspects of Indian Education—Past and Present.
Hunter, Sir W.	The Indian Empire.
Hyndman, H.M.	The Awakening of Asia.
Ilbert, Sir C.	The Government of India.
Joshi, G.N.	Indian Administration.
Kaye, J.	Administration of the East India Company.
Keith, A.B.	Constitutional History of India.
Keith, A.B.	Speeches and Documents on Indian Policy.
Keynes, J.M.	Indian Currency and Finance.
Lajpat Rai	Young India.
Lawrence, Sir H.	Essays, Military and Political.
Lovett, Sir V.	A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement.

Low, Sir Sidney	Vision of India.
Lyall, Sir Alfred	Asiatic Studies.
Lyall, Sir Alfred	Rise and expansion of British Dominion in India.
Macdonald, J. Ramsay	The Government of India.
MacMunn, Gen, Sir G.	The Martial Races of India.
MacMunn, Gen. Sir G.	The Indian Mutiny in Perspective.
Marriot, J.A.R.	The English in India.
Mayhew, A.	Christianity and the Government of India.
Mazumdar, J.K.	Indian Speeches and Documents on British Rule (1821-1918).
Moon, Penderel	Strangers in India.
Morison, T.	Economic Transition in India.
Morrison, J.	New Ideas in India During The Nineteenth Century.
Muir, Ramsay	The Making of British India.
Naoroji, Dadabhai	Poverty and un-British Rule in India.
Nundy, Alfred	Indian Unrest—Revolution or Evolution.
O'Dwyer, Sir M.	India as I Knew It.
Osburn, Col. A.	Must England Lose India?
Outram, James	Campaigns in India.
Pannikar, K. M.	Indian States.
Pannikar, K. M.	The Future of the South-East Asia.
Paranjpe, Dr. R.P.	The Crux of the Indian Problem.
Paul, K.T.	The British Connection with India.

Prasad, B.	India's Hindu-Muslim Question.
Prichard, I.T.	Administration of India (1850-1868).
Radhakrishnan, Sir, S.	The Hindu View of Life.
Raleigh, Sir T.	Lord Curzon in India.
Ranga Aiyer, C.S.	India—Peace or War.
Ranga Aiyer, C.S.	How to Lose India.
Roberts, Lord	Forty one years in India.
Ronaldshay, Lord	Life of Lord Curzon.
Ronaldshay, Lord	India—a Bird's Eye View.
Rushbrook Williams, Prof. L.F.	Reports on India.
Sayyid Ahmed Khan, Sir.	On the Present State of Indian Politics.
Seeley, Sir J.	Expansion of England.
Shafaat Ahmed, Sir	Indian Constitution, or the Govt. of India Act, 1935.
Sitaramaya, Dr. P.	History of the Indian National Congress.
Stoddard, L.	The Rising Tide of Colour Against White World Supremacy.
Strachey, Sir J.	India.
Thompson, E.	The Making of Indian Princes.
Thompson, E.	The Other Side of The Medal.
Thompson E. and Garratt G.I.	Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India.
Temple, Sir R.	India.
Trevelyan, Sir C.	On the Education of the People of India.

Townsend, Meredith — Asia and Europe.
Tubbs, N.H. — The Indian Students—India in Transition.

Wrench, Sir E. — Immortal Years.
English Works of Raja Ram Mohan Roy.
Life and Speeches of Hon. G. K. Gokhale.
Life and Speeches of Mohammad Ali Jinnah.
The Christian Life and Message in Relation to Non-Christian Systems.
Imperial Gazetteer of India (The Indian Empire) 1907-1909.
Census Reports of 1881, 1891, 1931, and 1941.
Report of the University Commission, 1917.
Report of the Central Advisory Board of Education, 1935-1943.
Report of the International Labour Organization, 1938.
Debates in the Houses of Parliament on the occasion of the passing of the Independence Act of 1947.
Montagu-Chelmsford Report.
Simon Commission Report.
Parliamentary Debates 1813, 1833.

INDEX

Books by the same author
in English

1. A Principal's Papers.
2. Towards understanding the Muslims of Sind.

★

THE BRITISH IN THE SUB-CONTINENT

By

SAYID GHULAM MUSTAFA

•

★ A balanced estimate of the sub-continent's cluttered past.

★ Courageous judgement on the men and matters of the period preceding the birth of our independence.

★ An outstanding contribution to the corpus of contemporary writing on a vital period of our national life.

★ A back-ground to events that led to the formation of modern India and Pakistan.

★ A stimulating and a very informative book.

•

Ferozsons Ltd.

KARACHI—HYDERABAD—LAHORE

RAWALPINDI—PESHAWAR